DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 117 FL 010 916

TITLE	President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies: Background Papers and Studies.
INSTITUTION	President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Nov 79
NOTE	270p.; For related document, see FL 010 842; Chapter entitled "Foreign Languages and the U.S. Multinational Corporation" by Marianne Inman is not included because it is available as FL 010 622
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock No. 017-080-02070-0, $7.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Business Communication; College Language Programs; Educational Attitudes; Educational Methods; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Studies; *Federal Government; High Schools; *International Studies; Language Attitudes; *Language Instruction; *Language Programs; Language Tests; Minority Groups; *Needs Assessment; Postdoctoral Education; Postsecondary Education; Research Libraries; Research Needs; *Second Language Learning; Surveys; World Affairs
IDENTIFIERS	Fulbright Exchange Program

ABSTRACT

The following reports by various authors concerning foreign languages and international studies are included: (1) a personal statement on international education by Betty Bullard; (2) "Foreign Languages in the American School"; (3) "High Schools for Foreign Language and International Studies: An Interagency Paper"; (4) "Ethnic Studies and International Studies: Interrelationships"; (5) "Indian Language Program and Washington Foreign Language Program"; (6) "Foreign Language Teaching in the Schools--1979--Focus on Methodology"; (7) "Methodological Trends in College Foreign Language Instruction: A Report"; (8) "Foreign Language Testing Background"; (9) "Foreign Languages in the USA: A National Survey of American Attitudes and Experience"; (10) "The Minority Student in the Foreign Language Field"; (11) "Undergraduate International Studies: The State of the Art and Prescriptions for the Future"; (12) Graduate Foreign Language and International Studies"; (13) "Statement on Advanced Training and Research in International Studies"; (14) "NDEA Centers: How They Use Their Federal Money"; (15) "International Studies and Research Library Needs"; (16) "The U.S. Government Employement of Foreign Area and International Studies Specialists"; (17) "The U.S. Government Requirements for Foreign Languages"; (18) "Background on the Fulbright Grantee Survey Conducted by the Fulbright Alumni Association"; (19) "The Fulbright Alumni Association's 1979 Survey"; (20) "Citizen Education in World Affairs"; (21) "International Business, Foreign Languages and International Studies/Analysis of Relationships and Recommendations"; and (22) the Secretary of State's message to the President's Commission. (JB)

ED179117

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES: Background Papers and Studies

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FL010 914

November 1979

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

Stock Number 017-080-02070-0

PREFACE

This volume of papers supplements the final report of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability. The final report sought to be relatively brief and to concentrate on directions for future action. Its aim was to reflect rather than recapitulate the array of studies and counsel which constituted much of the foundation for its recommendations.

The Commission's recommendations also were the product of many other sources and activities: the extraordinarily rich and diverse experience of Commission members and the educational process which took place within the Commission during its one-year mandate; the presentations to the Commission at its six regional hearings and at the numerous other meetings and conferences in which Commission members participated throughout the country, and the views communicated to the Commission orally or on paper by hundreds of interested individuals and organizations. Commission staff logged the written communications sent to it so that this important part of the Commission's work can be accessible in the future. The regional hearings and meetings of the Commission were either transcribed or summarized and hence are also part of the public record of its work.

The papers in this volume were written for the Commission at its request or with its encouragement. They were chosen to provide a wide-ranging coverage of the many topics of concern to the Commission. Although they do not purport to present a complete "state of the art" on foreign language and international studies, they should nevertheless clarify many of the needs and problems in this field as of 1979. To this extent it is hoped that they will provide additional guidance for future efforts as well as add to the literature in this important field.

One study specifically commissioned by the President's Commission is not included in this volume as it was published separately by the contracting organization, the Rand Corporation: Foreign Language and International Studies Specialists: The Marketplace and National Policy. Persons wishing copies of this study should write directly to the Rand Corporation, Santa Monica.

The views expressed in the papers published in this volume are those of the authors. It should therefore not be inferred that they represent the views of the President's Commission.

James A. Perkins
Chairman
November 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

Personal Statement to the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies 1
Betty Bullard

Foreign Languages in the American School 9
S. Frederick Starr

High Schools for Foreign Language and International Studies: An Interagency Paper 15
Esther Lipshy

Ethnic Studies and International Studies: Interrelationships 23
John N. Hawkins

Indiana Language Program and Washington Foreign Language Program 31
Melvin J. Fox

Foreign Language Teaching in the Schools--1979--Focus on Methodology 49
Helen P. Warriner

Methodological Trends in College Foreign Language Instruction: A Report 59
David P. Benseler and
Renate A. Schulz

Foreign Language Testing Background 71
Protase E. Woodford

Foreign Languages in the USA: A National Survey of American Attitudes and Experience 78
Peter A. Eddy

The Minority Student in the Foreign Language Field 81
Louise J. Hubbard

Undergraduate International Studies: The State of the Art and Prescriptions for the Future 90
James E. Harf

Graduate Foreign Language and International Studies 110
Roger Paget

Statement on Advanced Training and Research in International Studies 137
Robert E. Ward

NDEA Centers: How They Use their Federal Money 169
Ann I. Schneider

International Studies and Research Library Needs 175
William E. Carter

The U.S. Government Employment of Foreign Area and International Studies Specialists 187
James R. Ruchti

The U.S. Government Requirements for Foreign Languages 197
James R. Ruchti

Background on the Fulbright Grantee Survey Conducted by the Fulbright Alumni Association 221
Barbara B. Burn

The Fulbright Alumni Association's 1979 Survey 224
Arthur P. Dudden

Citizen Education in World Affairs 230
Carol Edler Baumann

International Business, Foreign Languages and International Studies/Analysis of Relationships and Recommendations 235
Samuel L. Hayden and
Leslie W. Koepplin

Foreign Languages and the U.S. Multinational Corporation See FL 010622
Marianne Inman

Message to the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies 311
Cyrus Vance

PERSONAL STATEMENT TO THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Betty Bullard, Commission Member

PERSPECTIVE

I. Introduction

The United States lies today under a serious mandate. She must break out of her myopic insularity, awaken from her recent brief period of lethargy, and come to grips with the totality of the world in which all mankind today live. Specifically, she is asked to take decisive steps toward making our national population more generally competent (1) in the use and comprehension of foreign languages and (2) in the sounder and more sympathetic understanding of foreign cultures. The purpose of this mandate is ultimately to improve communication and understanding in what is properly described as an increasingly interdependent world. In the words of the Charter establishing the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies:

"The Final Act of . . . the Helsinki Accord obligates all signatories, including the United States of America, to encourage the study of foreign languages and civilizations as an important means of expanding communication among peoples for their better acquaintance with the culture of each country, as well as for the strengthening of international cooperation.

The United States Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe adopted a resolution asking the President to appoint a special 'Commission to make recommendations to the President and the Congress on how to strengthen and improve language and area studies in the United States' and, thus, reverse the trend in the United States of declining general interest and competence in same."

Our Commission's special task is delineated in a list of functions spelled out in the Charter. I should like to direct attention to the second of these Functions. It calls for the Commission to "recommend ways to extend the knowledge of other civilizations to the broadest population base possible and to build these topics into the general curricula for students of all ages at all levels of study throughout the nation."

As a specialist in international education in schools ranging from the kindergarten through Grade 12, and with particular personal interest in Asia, I am concerned that our Commission permit nothing to distract it from responsibly fulfilling all its requisite functions. I regard it as incumbent upon the Commission to explore and finally recommend to the President and Congress significant and promising means of increasing our population's cultural awareness of other peoples of the world, commencing at the earliest levels of public and private institutional instruction and continuing though the collegiate level and beyond.

A pedagogical observation is in order at this point. Unless students are diligently and progressively prepared in a step-by-step fashion for "globe-wide perspective," it is not practicable suddenly to impose such a perspective upon them in college or later, no matter how splendid college and university programs in global studies may be or become. We must be reminded that international education is cumulative; it is a building process. It is not enough that students be given substantive, cognitive learning about other cultures; these must be accompanied by attitudinal changes of a radical sort. Only thus, it seems to me, will it be possible for the United States to overcome its present seeming self-centeredness and provincialism.

II. International Education in the Past

For over one hundred years there has been some form of teaching about people outside America's geographical borders in both elementary and secondary schools. All of us have traced the storied Nile to its source while learning that Egypt is her gracious gift. We have memorized the Plantagenet kings and sung about the Alps.

Events of the 1960's, however, changed all that. The Soviet launching of "Sputnik" had set USA on her ear. The immediate change in the schools was seen in both approach and content selection. Foreign language study was given a temporary impetus, but it was overshadowed by a tremendous new thrust in the study of the natural sciences. We are all familiar with the post-Sputnik educational projects and their impact on general education. So much had to do with hardware: money poured into language-learning labs--some now abandoned and lying unused, fancy equipment such as overhead projectors, tape recorders, and similar devices "which can only be used for languages." But at the same time there was beginning to be an emphasis on competency in speech as well as in structure, and cultural environment became more important as an instructional frame.

In the area of the social sciences, some very far-reaching national projects were undertaken, although no national curriculum was ever developed:

A. For perhaps the first time, university professors joined minds with educators involved with pre-college instruction to produce substantive, effective materials for teaching about other cultures. This was done through expensive national projects.

B. A somewhat subtle shift took place in emphasis from teaching facts as ends-in-themselves to teaching processes of inductive and deductive thinking whereby school pupils became aware of attitudes, moral choices, and similar intangibles.

C. Of particular importance was the stress laid on achieving a greater balance of representation of world areas in the curriculum. When most of us try to recall what we were taught about human cultures from kindergarten through Grade 12, we remember only United States history, the history of our own home state, and what was lumped into a bag known as "World" history, namely European, emphatically Western, culture commencing at Mesopotamia and the Nile Valley. Suddenly, out of the 1960's, sprang Africa, Asia, Latin America, and Canada. Only an uneasy peace has obtained since then.

As the years moved into the 1970's, foreign area studies in the pre-college grades, having hit a temporary high, began to show decline. This diminishing trend appears to have come about because of generally inadequate teacher background, unfamiliarity with new teaching techniques, professional insecurity, a paucity of support from authorities in policy-making positions, and some initial difficulty with identifying appropriate textbooks and supplementary instructional materials. As these problems accumulated, priorities became rearranged and the momentum previously attained began to slow down. The toll was taken.

An important lesson contained in this decline would appear to be that those efforts undertaken were directed "from above", so to speak, and failed to relate to the actual desires of local communities.

During the past six to eight years, efforts have been made to stem the tide. Alternate approaches have regularly made their appearance on the international scene, generating debate among advocates of "transnational", "intercultural", "multinational", "international", "transcultural", and "global" perspectives.

If one takes a close look at the past twenty years in U.S. primary and secondary education, one sees a persistent factor recurring with sufficient frequency to call attention to itself. This is a staunch dedication and purposefulness on the part of a strong few to have an international dimension in both formal and non-formal education which will produce a general public having basic international literacy. This commendable persistence needs reinforcement and encouragement. It is the foundation upon which viable new plans can be erected. We have come a long way, but we have a long way yet to go.

III. The Present Situation

Current trends in American education as related to international perspectives provide some grounds for encouragement. At the same time obstacles to progress remain. Let us examine the obstacles first.

The most serious problem is lack of "concern" or "responsibility" for international education at administrative levels on the part of organizational personnel who, by virtue of their authority, are the logical ones to promote such educational emphasis. Everywhere one hears that international education is "not a priority concern."

In general there has been a pulling-in of budgets reducing the purchases of instructional materials. Added to this is a nation-wide trend to "return to the basics" in education. Everywhere people are clamoring for the "three R's" while demanding competency-based testing and national assessment/accountability. Immediate relevance of schooling is demanded by taxpayers who are likely to regard funds spent on instruction about "foreigners" as a misappropriation of taxpayers' hard-earned dollars.

Another serious obstacle relates to the preparation of the teaching force. There is an extremely widespread and continuing weakness in the background of teachers apparently crippling their ability to teach anything of significance

that is international or global. There are good reasons for the state of affairs embodied in traditional emphasis on other priorities and jammed certification requirements.

There is a high percentage of turnover in the ranks of teachers. As good teachers of international studies are promoted, they are commonly replaced by teachers lacking adequate international background to carry on the good work of their predecessors.

An acute problem is the severe overcrowding of the schools' curricula. There are so many special emphases and "add-ons" in the curriculum that there is literally no time left for anything else. Pressures are brought to bear on the school curriculum--such components as career education, citizenship training, and free-enterprise economics. The "Right to Read" is another emphasis. What is squeezed out in the process is international, intercultural education--the very subject the President's Commission is mandated to expand.

The picture is clouded by those who want to play the "word game". When anyone advocates international education, quarreling over the terms used arises. Whether one uses intercultural, transnational, multicultural, or global, it all adds up to the same thing: our main search is for relationships with other peoples.

In the all-important matter of funding, schools find themselves today in a fluctuating situation. The latter years of the 1960's and the early years of the '70's saw private foundations giving large and visible support to international education. Now support is spotty. National Endowments and Foundations have offered sustained funding resources, and there are notable private organizations which are providing aid of tremendous importance. Among these are The Asia Society, The Foreign Policy Association, and a host of others. (See Elmendorf, Helping Americans Learn About the World: A Study of Private-Sector Activities, I.C.A., and the U.S.O.E. Internatioanl Education Directories for extensive identification.) These organizations help out where the main purpose is to be of assistance to the educational establishment to strengthen the international component in the curriculum.

Professional organizations such as the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Council for the Social Studies, the National Education Association, Modern Language Association, and the Association for Asian Studies, express their concerns through the existence of committees on international or global studies or committees on teaching about other areas or world topics.

Another trend, which is only moving at a slow and indefinite pace, is the growing and gradually more widespread utilization of community resources and teachers for instruction about others. An interesting and notable model for this is the program of Intercultural Outreach sponsored by Warren Wilson College in North Carolina. In this program students and teachers, who are either foreigners themselves or have expertise in a foreign culture, spend two or three days at a community presenting assembly programs, foreign meals, talks on substantive issues, and a mixture of instruction and entertainment

in the schools of the community to excite interest in the "outside" culture. Much work needs to be done in extending this sort of outreach and improving its effectiveness and focus. But it is a significant new trend.

There is increasing evidence of cooperation among scholars of world areas and regionally focused disciplines, teacher-educators, state education departments, and teachers themselves. Such cooperation materially benefits the professional development of teachers and makes possible the designing of more effective and useful materials for practical classroom instruction.

As alluded to above those who are directly involved with international education find today an imbroglio among the professionals over semantics. Subtle differences in the definitions of such terms as global, international, intercultural, and the like, have tended to divide educators into camps with efforts on the part of some to claim superiority for their point of view over others. Four terms, in particular, have led to inordinate discussion among the experts, but are of special relevance for the work of our Commission.

A. Global: Here is a space-age word resulting from views of earth from outer space. It is tending to replace "world," "international," or "universal," and according to the experts, connotes transcendence of international politics while stressing human inter-relatedness on one planet, earth, which is viewed as a "life-support system."

B. International: This term is used to designate relationships existing among separate, independent entities--nation-states--rather than the unifying inter-relatedness of all humankind as individual persons.

C. World-Mindedness: Usually applied to the general concern of Americans toward other nations or peoples of the world, coming into use during, and as a product of the issues raised by, the Second World War.

D. Intercultural: Here is a term originating in the work of social scientists and humanist scholars stressing the sociological, anthropological, and cultural relatedness of people generally.

A trend that reflects an important continuing need is foreign travel for both students and teachers. Of particular importance is student/teacher exchanges through established organizations. But equally effective are isolated, "seat-of-the-pants" operations which grow out of an individual teacher's experience.

Another trend is the concerted effort to orient those in school policy-making and decision-making capacities to the value to citizenship of an international dimension in education. Here is a challenge that needs constant and unrelenting thrust.

More and more the publishers of the textbooks and the media-producers appear to be trying to reflect with greater accuracy and realism other societies and their concerns. This consciousness-raising has been given impetus by recent studies conducted by The Asia Society, the Middle-East Association, the Latin American Studies Association, and the African-American Institute.

A matter of urgent concern is the resistance to learning about other peoples on the part of students themselves. Scholars who have attempted to analyze this resistance see it as a fourfold problem. It involves cognitive, attitudinal, personal, and communication barriers. Naturally individuals differ, so these four obstacles to the attainment of global perspective within the individual are not expected to be equally distributed. But they do exist and it is imperative that steps be taken to overcome them if we are to move our whole American population towards greater global-consciousness.

IV. Strategies For Change

In terms of the school curriculum below the college level, we have reached the limit for "add-ons" and infusions. The road to improved education is strewn with good ideas that did not take the fact of a curriculum's limit into consideration. Career education is a good example. Metric education is also a good example, but for another reason: going metric is a good idea, and public instruction to prepare for it was well planned and coordinated, but it seriously failed to develop a public advocacy and base of support. The implication is clear: partial, piecemeal remodelling of the curriculum for kindergarten through Grade 12 does not work.

Therefore, to make it possible for American children to have the opportunity to learn those skills, attitudes, and subject-contents necessary to be effective citizens as this country continues to develop and interact within the global context, major surgery is called for.

A. What is needed is a total restructuring of the curriculum.

Not since 1889 has there been a complete overhaul of the curriculum of America's public schools. In that year a report of the American Historical Association's Committee of Seven delineated substantially the basic outline of the social studies curriculum that is taught--much augmented--in our schools today. I believe it should be the recommendation of our Commission:

(1) That the President, in concert with the Secretary of Education, appoint a National Task Force on The Restructuring of the Public School Curriculum.

(2) That the Task Force heavily involve the professional associations, whether disciplinary, subject oriented, or pedagogical. Scholars, specialists of all sorts, writers of textbooks, professional educators and administrators must all work together on the project.

(3) That the Task Force recommend to the States a total reorganization of the curriculum for Grades K through 12.

(4) That the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, National Committee on the Accreditation of Teacher Education, National Education Association, American Federation of Teachers, American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages, Association of Childhood Education International, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, and other professional groups concerned with teacher training and certification draw up, in light of The Report of The Task Force, a Plan to reorder teacher-certification requirements and a program of teacher education. Far more substantive and experiential learning (beyond the walls of a classroom) must be made requisite for the certification of teachers.

(5) That national and regional school accreditation groups revise their guidelines and criteria in light of the recommendations of the above groups.

(6) That federal funds be invested in ten major school/teacher-training sites throughout the country. The sites are to be selected by the National Task Force from among nominations put forward by State education agencies and teacher-training institutions. At these ten sites three years will be devoted to model building, analysis, and revision.

(7) That during the three-year model building period, consistent and imaginative use of the media will be brought to bear in an effort to inform the public and develop a base of public support for the change.

(8) That extensive and sustaining federally-matched State funds be put into the implementation of the curriculum restructuring project for a period of no less than ten years. Initially the Federal funding would account for the largest portion of financial underwriting, but the Federal input would diminish as the states assume an increasing share of the costs on a planned scale.

It is anticipated that the change will take fifteen years from its inception to effect. In the meantime, other steps are needed to inch forward the status quo.

B. Coincidental to the restructuring process, private, state, and federal funds should be made available for responsible research, longitudinal and otherwise, conducted by educational psychologists and similar specialists and organizations to ascertain what is being done to children when teaching them about other cultural orientations, patterns of thought, and other culture-ordering of priorities. Such questions as the following should be explored: At what levels of maturity are specific skills and attitudes best taught? Through what means should what sort of foundation be constructed before a pupil completes high school?

The minimum result should be a base for internationally productive adult citizenship, even if the citizen gets no more personally involved in international concerns than the TV, newspaper, canned fish, or the ballot box.

C. Reinterpretation of existing federal legislation to include and give some priority to foreign languages and international studies. Some of the areas needing legislative reinterpretation include program regulations for Elementary and Secondary Education Act Titles IV and V, Teacher Centers, Right to Read, Career Education, and Vocational Education. And these represent but a small sample.

D. In pockets all over the country there exist models of scholar/educator cooperation. Some outreach operations of foreign area centers are outstanding. These models can be extended and multiplied through larger area workshops and cooperative travel opportunities designed to establish realizations of mutual need and respect. In the same vein, travel and exchange opportunities should be more strongly supported and encouraged in local school districts as well as in broader areas. Such opportunities are indispensable for clothing global themes with life and reality.

New designs for the professional development of teacher, both pre-service and in-service, need thought and actualization. The new Teacher Centers should be an integral part of this.

E. The P.T.A.'s, the national educational organizations and organizations representing international and special area interests should mount a major effort to create popular demand and recognition thereof by media sources. They should insist on larger international dimensions in programming and reporting, from comics, to soaps, to talk-shows, to masterpieces, to news items, and beyond.

The entire focus of The President's Commission is important. But it is through the Commission's boldness and decisive action in the realm of elementary and secondary education that the genius of the assignment will be demonstrated. There has never been a national body constituted by the President of the United States which has had as one of its major focuses to study and recommend far greater awareness and competency in international studies in pre-collegiate education. The Commission must make the most of this opportunity.

FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN THE AMERICAN SCHOOL

S. Frederick Starr
Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies
The Wilson Center

At the present moment some 3,800,000 American students in middle and high schools are studying foreign languages. This figure is five times greater than the number of college and university students of foreign languages. To train these millions of pupils, approximately 70,000 teachers are offering courses on modern foreign languages at middle and high schools - over twice the number of post-secondary school foreign language teachers.

These figures alone indicate that the teaching of foreign languages at the pre-university level is a large-scale activity involving practically every school system in the fifty states. Though far smaller in scale than the teaching of English, mathematics, and science, foreign language teaching is by no means a frill to be taken seriously only when the "basic" courses are solidly in place. By virtue of its scale alone, to say nothing of other measures the teaching of foreign languages at the school level must command the attention of anyone seriously interested in the problem of languages in American life.

Notwithstanding the scale of the enterprise, pre-university language education has been neglected by the schools themselves and all but ignored by university-level educators and public officials concerned with the subject. This traditional neglect was enshrined and even legitimated in the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the authors of which assumed that the central locus of language teaching in America should be at the university level.

While the NDEA did not entirely neglect America's schools, it did attempt to build a national structure of international studies from the roof down. While the great vitality of America's universities in the 1950's may have rendered plausible such an approach, the "trickle-down effect" was more limited than it was hoped. The attempt failed. As a result, the structure of foreign language teaching and international studies in the United States still lacks a proper foundation in the schools. Until it acquires one, the superstructure of advanced training and research will never have the soundness and permanence that is now so urgently called for.

A STATISTICAL OVERVIEW

A major impediment to the improvement of foreign language teaching at the pre-university level has been the inadequacy of data on the subject. Recently, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages and the Modern Language Association have moved to remedy this problem, through the periodic compilation of data on enrollments. This information, for which

the profession is deeply indebted to the initiative of C. Edward Scebold and Richard I. Brod, is of immense importance in alerting the country to the critical situation that now exists. The following overview is based largely upon their statistics, and upon such other data as I have been able to assemble. Together, these sources reinforce the well-known picture of decline in language study at the pre-university level.

Before turning to the extent of that decline, it is well to stress that there exists no past golden age to which today's advocates of modern language teaching can aspire. In 1890 the percentage of American high school students studying modern foreign languages was about 16. Of this group, fully two-thirds were studying German, with most of the remainder studying French. Virtually all other modern foreign languages were neglected in the schools.

Looking backward, one might have thought that the last decades before the "Guns of August" in 1914 might have witnessed declines in enrollment. For example, the enormous immigration from Eastern Europe might have called forth assimilationist sentiments that would have been hostile to the study of foreign languages. On the contrary, in precisely these years there was a boom in the study of modern foreign languages that continue unabated down to World War I.

In 1915, thirty-six percent of American students at the pre-university level were studying modern foreign languages. This figure has never been reached since. Following the First World War, however, a long decline set in. By the mid-1950's, enrollments were down from 36 to 20%. By 1960, under the first impact of Sputnik, it had risen from 20 to 23%, and to 24% by 1965. Stated differently, the measurable impact of Sputnik on pre-university language study in the United States was not more than 20% of the pre-Sputnik total - an insignificant figure in terms of the small base as of the 1950's.

By 1970, enrollments in modern language courses had declined from 24 to 23% of annual enrollments. By 1974 it had dropped to 18%. While precise figures on 1978 are not yet at hand, one may safely assume that they do not exceed 15% - less than half of the percentage for 1915.

The data upon which this overview is based are so gross as to obscure many significant developments. Taking a closer view, one finds that the actual situation is far more grim than data on overall enrollments would suggest.

It need scarcely be mentioned that the cost of teaching modern foreign languages is borne largely by local and state tax levies. The U.S. Office of Education plays no more role in this area than it does in other aspects of statewide education, as mandated by the Constitution. Hence, the progress of foreign language teaching is dependent upon thousands of local decisions, and therefore subject to immense local variation.

To cite examples from the mid-1970's the range of enrollments extends from Mississippi, where approximately 5% of students in grades 7-12 are studying modern foreign languages, up to Connecticut, where the corresponding figure is 36%. Ohio stands at about 17%; Arizona at 21%, New Hampshire at 29%.

If the absolute levels vary, so does the impact of decline from region to region, and not always in the direction one might expect. In the first half of the 1970's, modern language study in Delaware's high schools dropped 38%, in Missouri's by 32%, and in New Mexico's by 29%. By contrast, Connecticut's enrollments dropped by only 9% during the same period, and Pennsylvania's by only 8%. Nebraska actually increased its enrollments by 7% between 1970 and 1975; Arizona increased 26% and Georgia increased fully 46%. It will be observed that these changes follow no clear regional pattern. While it is true that enrollments in New England and the Mid-West have shown clear strength and that those in the Old South have not, the exceptions are at least as dramatic as the generalizations.

Clearly, whatever sociological factors one may wish to invoke, they cannot be considered absolute de-terminants of language policy. As Fred. M. Hechinger of the New York Times has reminded the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, the role of leadership in the development of foreign language teaching is enormous.

Let us now view these same data from a slightly different vantage point. Doubtless, the figure of 18% of American students of grades 7-12 studying any foreign language in the Mid-1970's is in itself cause for concern. But this figure still exaggerates the modest strengths that exist.

In the first place, those studying modern foreign languages in the late 19th and early 20th centuries benefited from prior study of Latin. In 1905, fully 51% of American high school students were studying Latin. Today the figure is 1%. This means that 49% of American students who once brought to the study of modern foreign languages the experience of their exposure to a highly structured classical tongue can not do so today. It is difficult to overestimate the value of this lost resource.

In the second place, the figures cited earlier exaggerate the strength of the present situation because they represent only gross enrollments. They cover everything from introductory courses in the 7th grade through sixth-level courses for high school seniors. The overwhelming majority of these students studying Spanish, French, German, and Russian are in first or second year programs. Stated differently, approximately 60% of Americans studying these same languages are concentrated in the first year alone.

Attrition is enormous. The most common experience for American students of modern foreign languages is to endure the most difficult and least rewarding phase of a program without gaining access to the natural rewards that make such study tolerable. Most American students don't learn enough to build upon later and in fact do not build upon what they learn. Quitting after a year or two, their experience with modern foreign languages is marked by understandable bitterness and frustration. Later, when such students find themselves on local school boards they act upon this unsuccessful learning experience, to the detriment of language programs.

Granted that real proficiency is not developed in the first two years, what about the advanced levels? From the large number of students beginning the study of Spanish in the United States, only 4% proceed to the fourth year. Attrition in French is only half as great, but in German it is as great as for Spanish.

It is appealing to think that those students who enter upon the study of a foreign language because it is near to their own ethnic heritage would be more likely to persist than would other students. Facts do not bear this out. The widely publicized boom in the study of Italian is almost entirely concentrated in first and second year courses. The same must be said for Spanish and other leading "ethnic" languages. Notwithstanding the supposed interest of Polish-American in their linguistic heritage, the Modern Language Association and American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages together were able to locate 81 students in American high schools studying Polish beyond the second year level. Whatever the benefits of ethnic studies programs, the ethnic movement in the United States has not yet had a significant impact upon the quality of education in modern foreign languages.

Concluding our review of the advanced levels of modern language study at the American high school and middle school, let us translate data on attrition into more comprehensive terms. If 18% of all public school students in grades 7-12 are studying a modern foreign language in a given year, and if 90% of those students are in the first or second year courses, then only 1.8% of American students are enrolled in courses at the third year level or higher. Let us grant that in any given class that figure might be higher, and let us remember, too, that the figure represents a percentage of all secondary school enrollments and not the number of graduates who have had any language experience. Finally, let us grant that the figure would be higher at most private schools and at elite public schools. But the same figure in practically every other advanced industrial nation would be close to 100%. Indeed, many Third World nations now boast similarly high percentages. Thus, the United States' neglect of modern foreign language study in the schools is an absolute anomaly among nations.

In our discussion so far we have grouped together all modern foreign languages, without pausing to note the condition of any one of them. But there is so little teaching of certain critical languages as to cause one to question whether the United States will in the the future possess the requisite fund of linguistically competent citizens. Russian, which has a reasonable claim to our attention, is being studied by only 3,500 public school pupils any level beyond the second year. While 1,071 students are now studying fourth-year at the pre-university level, the number for Japanese is fewer than 200. Notwithstanding the intensification of Sino-American relations in recent months, there were only 197 third-year high school students of Chinese in the mid-1970's. Even if that figure were to be increased by 1,000%, it would be alarmingly low.

As if the picture conjured up by these data were not already sufficiently grim, it must now be altered to take three further considerations. First, all the statistics cited above are measures of teaching, not of learning. It is an unfortunate fact that the teaching of modern foreign languages in American schools is frequently poor because teachers lack access to adequate training programs and they have few opportunities to refresh their skills once acquired.

Second, the overall picture must be adjusted because the data do not take into account the steady process of erosion in language skills. As some are learning, others are forgetting. If one takes French or Japanese during his freshman and sophmore year of high school, he can count on forgetting most of it by graduation.

Third, the statistical overview must be adjusted downward to take into account the further slippage that has occurred between the surveys of 1974-5 and 1978. Whether or not the situation has "bottomed out" as some people claim, the last three years have certainly seen a continuation of the general downward trend that has prevailed since 1915.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

Faced with the situation described above, one could reasonably conclude that the best solution would be to wipe the slate clean and begin anew. Some propose that American education make a fresh start with foreign languages by teaching them in grade schools. Others propose that renewed efforts be made at the university and post-graduate levels.

Reasonable arguments can be made in behalf of each of these proposals. Yet to adopt so radical a remedy would be to deny the elemental strengths that do exist in our middle and high school language programs. First, as has been noted, there are some 70,000 teachers in place, their salaries in most cases being line items in school budgets. By contrast, no such cadre of modern language teachers exists in the primary schools.

Second, notwithstanding the general decline in the teaching of modern foreign languages, certain less commonly taught languages have actually experienced an increase in high school enrollments. Thus, both Japanese and Chinese enrollments have grown in recent years, though, regrettably, secondary school enrollments in Russian declined from 23,338 in 1970 to 17,115 in 1974.

Third, even amidst the general erosion of high school language programs, there has been a steady if modest advance at the middle-school level.

In light of these various assets, however modest they may be in comparison with the liabilities, it would seem wise to seek means of building upon them.

Various specific proposals are readily at hand. One that deserves attention is to create adequate means for training and re-training high school language teachers. This could be accomplished by activating certain neglected sections of the National Defense Education Act or by new legislation, if necessary. Funds could be made available to selected universities that provide such programs on a state-wide basis.

A second proposal that has been much discussed recently is to establish a few international high schools around the United States where languages could be taught with such effectiveness as to demonstrate the possibility of success to doubting teachers, parents, and administrators. Again, the establishment of such institutions could be encouraged through existing programs for "magnet schools" or through fresh legislation.

Still another proposal that has much to recommend it involves the compilation of adequate data on language competence. In the fields of math and English, national data on the acquisition of competence are collected annually. The public announcement of these data constitutes a kind of thermometer

of those fields, reminding the public constantly of the state of health prevailing in them. If we had analogous data on the acquisition of foreign language competence in American schools we would, for the first time, have a rigorous means of evaluating our progress and of setting realistic goals.

Numerous such proposals exist. Since the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies was created to assemble and evaluate them, it would be premature to dwell upon them here in a greater detail. Suffice it to say that the situation is even more serious than the depressing statistics issued by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages and the Modern Language Association might suggest. Various practical if limited steps can and should be taken to improve the situation. At the same time, the fate of foreign language study in American schools in the twentieth century calls for a truly bold initiative--a dramatic and long-term commitment to measures that have not heretofore been considered possible. This is surely what Congressman Paul Simon had in mind when he proposed that the President's Commission be established, and what President Carter expected when he charged the Commission with making fundamental recommendations regarding the development of programs in foreign languages and international studies.

HIGH SCHOOLS FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES: AN INTERAGENCY PAPER

Esther Lipshy
International Communication Agency

The future prosperity and even independence of the United States may well rest on our ability to interact with the world in ways that are viewed by others as being equitable and reasonable. Both for our own benefit and as the ultimate courtesy, we must be prepared to deal with foreign political, intellectual, business and other leaders in their own languages. We must understand their cultures so as to better appreciate the objectives, values, and attitudes that underlie our mutual dealings.

We can no longer interact with the rest of the world through a handful of scholars, specialists in the Foreign Service and the international business community, relying on interpreters and translators for other undertakings.

In the decades ahead, the United States will need ever increasing numbers of professional and technical people in a wide variety of fields able to deal effectively and substantively with another culture, possessing fluency in language skills.

The following proposal is a modest and reasonably low-cost approach to the development of a core group of such people within the United States.

I. THE CONCEPT

The President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies was initiated in response to the very marked decline in both interest and financial support for language and cultural studies in almost every sector--national and local, public and private. This downward spiral has been generated by decreasing levels of educational support,[1] by less funding from the foundations, and by declining foreign language enrollments in high schools and colleges. What is needed is a concept with broad appeal, which will turn this cycle around to prepare people who can cope with a world in which the fate of the United States will be tightly interwoven with that of other countries. To prepare us to meet these needs, the natural constituency for such a concept must be found in the local community itself.

The concept of high schools for foreign languages and international studies is a modest and reasonable proposal to address these needs. Not only would these schools stimulate parent and student interest and facilitate language teaching opportunities, but they could also create a new example of how a public school can best concentrate its resources in an innovative way. Such schools would enroll and challenge bright and motivated students.

[1]For instance, federal money for retraining teachers for language teaching has all but dried up since the mid '60's. In addition, no new funds have been allowed to compensate for inflationary factors, such as in the Fulbright scholarship program.

High schools for foreign language and international studies can and have already been developed in a few places for intensive study in the major European cultures and languages, but there is a growing recognition of the need for more knowledge of non-Western languages and cultures. Less commonly studied world languages and cultures, such as Japanese, Arabic, Chinese or Russian, should be encouraged in the proposed high schools.[2]

The curriculum of such a secondary school would place special emphasis on foreign languages and international studies, though all normally required courses would also be offered. The objective would be to give graduates a mastery of a second language (other than the one spoken at home) so that eventually the language skill could be paired with professional training to meet the growing need for foreign language proficiency in professional fields: international trade, journalism, banking, and management consulting.

The major foreign language studied by students in these high schools would also be used as the medium of instruction for generally required subjects as soon as feasible, thus integrating mastery of the language into the entire curriculum. Students should also gain a beginning knowledge (two years minimum) of a third language, for graduation. Moreover, special purpose "foreign language" high schools would provide strong concentration of resources in not only languages, but also in the international aspects of history, sociology, anthropology, music, art, and literature. In short, the mastery of a foreign language would be a tool for the intellectual exploration of other cultures.

Admission to the high schools should be based at the outset solely on motivation, demonstrated by application for admission and a willingness to assume the burdens of time and travel to the special facility. Indeed, the extremely low absenteeism rates at other special purpose high schools show that student motivation is a major factor in their success. If aptitude testing or other criteria appear needed after the program is in operation for a few years, they could, at the discretion of the local school district, be introduced. At the outset a first come, first served approach should be tried. Because language learning appears not to correlate directly with general intelligence scores, self-selection may work best until more experience is gained.

Special purpose high schools are not a new concept. Successful examples now in operation include the three science high schools and one performing arts school in New York City, the Boston Latin School, or the high schools for art, music, performing arts or design in Washington, D.C. and Cincinnati. Several European countries have established such language and international schools: the Russian "Internat" schools and certain German Gymnasia which offer intensive courses in language and area studies.

The experience of some of these special purpose schools speaks to the viability and attractiveness of special purpose education. Uniformly, one

[2]"Uncommon languages such as Chinese, Japanese and Arabic still make up 1% of public secondary school (foreign language) enrollments (10% college) although they are spoken by more than 80% of the world's population." (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages)

finds extremely high morale for students, few discipline problems, high attendance rates,[3] extraordinary levels of parent support and involvement,[4] successful college entrance for almost all students,[5] and professional distinction on the part of their graduates. Not surprisingly, these schools tend to attract the best teachers.

II. WHY FEDERAL SUPPORT AT THE HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL?

National Need

That we live in an interdependent world is self-evident. This direction can only accelerate, intensifying the country's need for academic, professional and political leaders who can understand, interpret and communicate accurately with people of other nations.

While we cannot specify the exact number of such experts that will be required, such people are going to be increasingly essential. More and more, government, business and professional leaders will require experts who combine foreign language mastery, with specialized knowledge of other societies.

Cost-Benefit - Greatest at the High School Level

A closely targeted approach to producing this expertise which achieves the most efficient use of resources calls for an investment in pre-collegiate foreign language teaching, probably at the high school level. Focus on that level is likely to receive community (and home) support, has the greatest potential for reversing the downward trend of language enrollments, and could catalyze renewed attentions and financial support for teacher training in the language field. Language learning requires significant study time at the outset. Once the basics are mastered, the skill can be reinforced and extended with fewer hours of study. It is more cost-effective to establish this base at the pre-collegiate level than at the more costly collegiate.

High School Begins the Process

The decline in the study of foreign language and area studies is evident throughout our educational system.[6]

[3]The School for International Studies at Hillcrest High School in New York City reports an attendance rate of 86%.

[4]Several of the special purpose schools have very successful international food festivals in which parents, students, and faculty all participate.

[5]Brooklyn Tech finds 98% of their students go on to college; Boston Latin, New York's High School for Music and Art, and Bronx Science also report similar figures.

[6]In 1968, 27% of public school 7th through 12th grades were studying a foreign language; this dropped to about 17% in 1976, with the largest declines in German (12%), French (10%), and Russian (33%). More than 20% of public secondary schools offer no foreign language courses, and relatively few offer instruction past the second year. No statistics are available on private schools. (Statistics from American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and the Modern Language Association (MLA)).

The "trickle down" theory--hoping that funds spent at the post-graduate level return dividends at the college level and then high school level--has not worked.[7] It funds basic language and culture learning at the costliest point in the educational process. Needed instead is a high concentration of targeted resources in an intensive time frame at a level in the educational system which is less costly and more effective educationally than the post-secondary.

Some experience leans toward attacking the problem where language learning is most felicitous--in elementary grades where students are least self-conscious and there is least chance of developing faulty accents and grammatical patterns. Financial constraints, however, at least in the short-run, mandate concentrating human and financial resources for intensive foreign language teaching and hence involving that much smaller group of students electing to enroll in the proposed high schools. By then, student interest and motivation begin to be sorted out, and the Federal Government and school systems can make a combined effort. Language and international studies high schools would offer the most highly motivated students a chance to enroll in intensive language and international studies curricula, where both funds and teachers can be concentrated in an efficient manner. While this modest program will never be enough, it would assure that some students (more than now) begin language and international studies in a serious way at the pre-collegiate level.

The secondary schools presently suffer from mixed priorities (special interests promoting driver, consumer, drug, etc. courses of study); teachers struggling with large classes and behavior problems; and insufficient financial and administrative support. But it is at this educational level that students typically have fewest competing financial and personal demands. Many high schools are large enough to teach specialized languages, too costly at the elementary level. Further, students entering college able to use a foreign language as a tool, can ease some of the burden on the university for this costly basic teaching. With advanced language skill, a student can begin area/international college study at a more sophisticated level.

Community Level Support is Inherent

High schools are part of a local community network--social, political, business and home. They are highly visible--an integral part of community structure. Focusing a local high school on foreign language and international cultures can stimulate attention and insight on the diverse racial, religious, ethnic, and cultural elements present in the local community. These high schools could coordinate existing community international education activity, through such groups as Sister Cities, COSERV, IVIS. Because citizens involved in these activities would welcome this new international component, local groups committed to international education would become yet more involved in it. Gradually, as such community support strengthens, the shift to local financial support is likely to be a natural transition and should become a condition of federal support, thereby affirming that local and state agencies play the central role in educational change and hence are and must be attuned to community needs and interests.

[7]The number of colleges requiring a foreign language for admission or graduation has dropped from 73% in 1967 to 53% in 1977 (MLA). MLA surveyed 500 colleges last year and found 4% indicated an upward trend in language requirements and 11% dropped or reduced requirements in the last year.

Multiplier Effect

Special purpose language high schools could develop as community centers for other cultural, ethnic and international interests, and could produce networks among such organizations. These schools could be a focal point for teacher exchanges, summer study abroad, and ethnic studies programs. Organizations such as Youth for Understanding, the American Field Service, Sister Cities, the Experiment in International Living, Peace Corps, Earthwatch, and others could utilize their facilites and resources. Office of Education programs in Global Education, Group Projects Abroad, and teacher exchanges would be natural tie-ins. The efficient use of funds in a concentrated manner would have a multiplier effect. Such concentration on cultural study in the secondary curriculum could maximize the dollar investment for the whole community.

Broad Range of Students

One great strength of these schools is the broad base of potential students to be served. Though high quality and above average academic background are stressed, equal access is essential. A significantly wide range of students could be challenged, interest in international study would be tapped from throughout the student population. The experience of other specialized high schools affirms that high school subject specialization can be effective and democratically oriented. (Their enrollment generally reflects the population spectrum of the community at large.) High schools for foreign language and international studies would testify to the applicability of specialized secondary education in those fields. The proposed special high schools would allow students whose first language is not English to build on their "home" language as a first language and to pursue English as their second language. The requirement for beginning level study of a third language should apply to all students, whether English is their first or second language. Practical considerations of staff and money, however, would necessarily restrict the curriculum in individual schools to a few "home languages" as a minimum number of students and teachers would be needed for them (as for all courses). However, the fact of giving academic credit to students to study their "home" language implies a respect for their heritage, thus enhancing their self-image and their academic goals. It would encourage foreign language study more broadly by socio/economic groups who tend not to aspire to go to college.

For the highly motivated or high achievement student, a high school for foreign language and international studies would allow him/her to obtain a specialized skill at the pre-collegiate level. On entering college, the student would be ready for in-depth study of other fields. Having acquired a fundamental language tool, the student could use the language to pursue the substantive study of history, culture or literature.

Finally, these schools would provide early language training for future professionals in a wide variety of fields. Such trained multi-cultural professionals would be a significant asset to the United States.

III. THE MECHANISM FOR ESTABLISHING HIGH SCHOOLS FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

To produce the personnel and funding for high schools for foreign language and international studies will require a unique set of federal, state and local interactions.

A. National committee to set general priorities and criteria

A national committee should be established to determine priorities and criteria for planning the system of foreign language and international studies high schools. In its planning the national committee should assure that enough schools are set up so that a significant number of students are enrolled throughout the country. The national group should establish a priority listing every five years of the major languages that appear to be in short supply and of the less commonly taught languages that will be needed in the years ahead (e.g., Arabic, Chinese, Russian, etc.). The advisory committee should also play a major role in a competitive selection process to determine which local school districts receive federal funds to support the schools.

B. Funding: A sliding scale

In order to assure local participation and financial support, funding should be based on a sliding scale. Federal funds should be limited to a 6-year period: 1 year for planning and 5 years for operational costs -- after which all costs should be born by state and local authorities. An incentive formula of state/federal matching would assure that only those school districts with a strong commitment to the program objectives would apply to set up one of the special purpose schools, a factor essential to success, as reported in a 1978 Rand Corporation study of federal efforts to improve schools. This study found that programs in which 100% federal funding terminated, local support was not forthcoming without prior community investment.

A sliding scale of local/federal funding might be:

	Federal	State
1st year	100%	(Planning)
2nd year	75%	25%
3rd year	66 2/3%	33 1/3%
4th year	50%	50%
5th year	25%	75%
6th year	10%	90%

A condition of federal funding might be to require the local school district to continue the program for four years after the completion of the Federal grant.

C. Annual review

A multi-year grant, with annual reporting and review to the National Committee, is recommended to assure program continuity as well as a method for evaluation and flexibility. As problems are encountered, changes would be implemented or adjustments made.

D. National competition

The potential benefits of this program to students, teachers and communities are significant; therefore, a funding mechanism should allow for distribution throughout the nation. A national competition of local school districts administered through state education agencies, would assure that no particular region or state is unduly favored. In this competition the state authorities would select among school district proposals to submit to the national committee for final selection, and would certify to their own commitment to such proposals.

Preference could be given to Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) for funding in joint metropolitan areas (as is done for vocational schools).

The Schools - Procedures and Operations

Procedures and operations could be patterned after the experience of already existing special purpose high schools, and might be structured as follows:

1. Admission policies - initially based on student interest and motivation.[8]

2. Teacher training - funding mechanisms should ensure sufficient money to train an adequate number of teachers. Language and Area Centers funded by NDEA Title VI might be required or requested to assist in the training of teachers and the development of teaching materials for the selected high schools.

3. Equipment and materials - funding mechanisms should ensure sufficient money for special equipment (language labs, films, tapes) or other resources and materials. This would include books and supplies needed for teaching and training.

4. Additional costs[9] - costs above normal operating levels (based on local school district student/teacher ratios) for special purpose high schools could be made available through other federal programs, such as NDEA Title VI, section 603, for citizen education which includes cultural understanding at the pre-collegiate level.

5. Curriculum - the curriculum requirements established by state law would set the minimum for graduation. The courses offered for language and international studies could be in addition to those requirements. Actually, students can now graduate with close to five years of course work by utilizing study halls, lunch periods, and individual research courses for special courses. This curriculum could use that special time in a purposeful way.

[8]Admission preference might be given to those sudents who have demonstrated ability and interest by beginning language study at the junior high level. For the more difficult "uncommon" languages (i.e., Russian, Chinese), study beginning at the junior high level would be a great advantage; preferential admissions would be an incentive to early language study.

[9]Special purpose schools need not be more costly. Several administrators of special purpose schools report that costs per capita are not more than other schools in their district and even lower than vocational schools. This is due to their ability to use their teachers and facilities to capacity, with students in classes a full day.

6. Enrollment size - for purposes of greatest educational efficiency an enrollment should be established which balances learning success and instructional costs. An essential aspect of enrollments will be keeping language classes small enough for effective learning.

IV. CAPITATION GRANTS - SUPPORT TO LANGUAGE DEPARTMENTS THROUGHOUT LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The Language and International Studies High School will be a major asset to the school districts that undertake the program. Some steps also need to be taken to encourage language studies in regular high schools. The National Committee might be empowered to pay directly to each teacher a small grant ($10 to $25 per pupil) for all third and fourth year students engaged in language study. The money could be used as the class determines to buy educational materials (e.g., foreign language newspaper subscriptions) or have a cross-cultural experience (e.g., rent a foreign language film). By making capitation grants available on a flexible basis for such enrichment activities, advanced language studies would be encouraged throughout all school districts.

V. PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

This recommendation to the Commission for establishing special purpose high schools is founded on the belief that new and innovative approaches are needed to the teaching of foreign language and international studies. The objective of the proposal is to assure that a sufficient number of specialists are being trained today to meet the increasing international needs of Americans in the political, professional and academic spheres in the future. The concept of a special purpose high school is sound; the need for a new approach is glaring--statistics of decreasing enrollments confirm the trend away from language specialties; the mechanism to set up such schools is uncomplicated--already existing patterns of funding provide a blueprint; the resources are available--community organizations, education agencies and federal programs have the knowledge and expertise required.

The Commission is urged to support this recommendation and bring attention to this concept at the highest levels of Government.

ETHNIC STUDIES AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES: INTERRELATIONSHIPS

John N. Hawkins
Assistant Professor, Graduate School of Education
University of California, Los Angeles

In this report some possible interrelationships between ethnic studies and international studies will be explored. At the outset it should be recognized that the suggestions and recommendations contained in this report are based on the experiences of this writer in working with the four NDEA area studies centers on the UCLA campus as well as with two of the ethnic studies centers (Asian-American, Chicano Studies).* In addition, a literature search was conducted through the ERIC system yielding 83 citations on the interrelationships between ethnic and international studies. These documents represent a secondary source of information on this topic. It is not possible to go into a great deal of depth regarding each of the various discussions contained in the articles and documents that were analyzed, rather, many of the points have been summarized and synthesized. Finally, interviews were conducted with selected individuals associated with the area studies centers and the ethnic studies centers, and with selected individuals from other institutions. The concerns of participants at the San Francisco hearings have also been incorporated where feasible.

Background

It should be clearly recognized that ethnic studies and international studies represent two discrete entities. The literature on each of these fields as separate community, academic, and research endeavors is enormous (in ERIC alone the file for "ethnic" studies and "international" studies yields over 1,000 citations each for the period 1970-79). No attempt is made in this paper to do justice to the breadth and scope of these areas as separate fields of inquiry. In fact, it should be noted that there are many, in both international and ethnic studies, who would deny that there is, should be, or ever will be any reasonable relationship between these two areas. However, here we are simply stating for the record those aspects of both programs where some cooperation is currently being experienced and suggesting areas where more cooperation might be pursued in the future. In order to place this discussion in some sort of context, it will be necessary to briefly state the various goals and objectives for both ethnic studies and international studies before moving on to examine the three areas that have emerged as most promising for future interaction and cooperation (relationship to schooling at the precollegiate level; collegiate level; the language and culture issue).

The emergence of ethnic studies during the past two decades was often characterized by an environment of political struggle and hostility toward the area by the educational establishment. Yet the fact is that many programs have survived and today are viable components of higher education. What are some of the reasons given to justify this field of inquiry; what are some of the goals and objectives? The list is quite long but here are some of the goals and

---

*A list of the centers contacted is appended.

objectives that seem to emerge most often. One line of reasoning places the emphasis first on providing an alternative educational experience to minority students that will foster leadership training and develop critical thinking in the context of the student's own cultural and historical experience. Related to this is a desire to improve communication capabilities and increase scholastic motivation. By engaging in a program of study that will improve the self-image of the group in question, it is suggested that a more positive image will emerge in the community as a whole. These goals are focused on the needs of a particular ethnic group to foster its specific educational, social, and psychological needs. Another view utilizes a more integrated approach with slightly different goals and objectives. In this view the purpose of ethnic studies and/or multicultural programs (here we see a shift away from ethnic specific concerns) is to explore cultural and historical antecedents of ethnic groups in general for purposes of expanding the notion of the "human family." The idea here is to demonstrate how similarities transcend differences, how cultures are interdependent, and how we must develop a value system of tolerance in order to avoid stereotyping different groups and individuals. In this way, both the self-image of the individual minority group and the majority group will be enhanced. This approach cuts across ethnic boundaries and is often developed in an interdisciplinary manner. Both approaches are operationalized through programs of study, degrees, publications, community action activities, and research.

Similar goals and objectives can be found with respect to international or area studies. While area studies programs can be traced to a recognition that the United States was unprepared with experts and generalists for most major regions of the non-Western world there were also goals and objectives that transcended national interest. It is generally recognized in the arena of international studies that there is a need for both the area expert (a degree candidate similar to the ethnic studies degree) and the generalists (one who has had some exposure through the curriculum with studies related to a non-Western culture, similar again to students who have taken a few ethnic studies courses). Many if not most individuals associated with area studies would agree that one fundamental goal of such programs is to break out of an overemphasis on Western-oriented studies. This represents a recognition that students need to develop a greater understanding of non-Western societies, to expand understanding of other people, increase empathy, or in the words of Robert Ward, to break down "mental segregation." Area and international studies can also be viewed as being relevant to today's world, providing a degree of knowledge and understanding increasingly necessary in what some call the "global village." International literacy is beginning to be recognized as a priority area equal to mathematics and reading literacy. Again, these rather global goals and objectives are expressed through formal study programs, publications, research and community activities (termed "outreach" in this case).

The goals and objectives of ethnic studies and international studies as stated above are not significantly different although the target audience differs in each case. A major problem in developing cooperative relationships between these two areas has been the lack of a common philosophical base (at least as perceived by many in both fields of inquiry). Lacking this kind of understanding, many program directors begin with the assumption that the goals and objectives of each area would also be mutually exclusive. Yet when engaging in a general discussion with participants in each of these areas as to their overall goals, what emerges is a set (albeit at a high level of generality) of goals that intersects in several areas.

Certainly, there is enough "philosophical" overlap to engage in some limited cooperative ventures. What kinds of ventures are currently underway and what might be developed in the future?

Relationship to schooling: Precollegiate level

At no time in the history of American education has there been a greater emphasis placed on infusing into the precollegiate curriculum concepts, materials, activities, and experiences related to the study of culture and cultural diversity. Roughly one-half of the states have mandated some form of multicultural education both for teachers (pre and in-service) and students (ethnic awareness courses, multi-cultural curricular changes, "mankind" studies, etc.). Teacher education institutions have also revised their curricula to include new course offerings on education and cultural diversity, have hired specialist faculty, and have engaged in a bewildering variety of "workshops" to sensitize teachers to the cultural diversity they will find in the classroom. Of the many problems and criticism voiced by those engaged in these activities, one recurring topic has to do with the lack of reliable curricular materials available to the teacher and the lack of understanding of the methodologies of culture learning. Another area has been the need to effectively link ethnic/multi-cultural studies with the social science curriculum, which more often than not focuses attention on world problems. Here, it appears, is an area of inquiry almost naturally suited to a cooperative venture between those concerned with ethnic studies and those area studies centers and programs engaged in some sort of "outreach" activity. Two major research goals deserve attention here: 1) the development of more effective instruments for measuring the impact of the study of culturally diverse groups, other societies, and so on, on knowledge and attitudes of both teachers and students; and 2) the need to strengthen teaching about the cultural backgrounds of minority groups in the United States within the broader context of examining the contributions of all to the common cultural heritage of mankind. The first goal addresses the need to provide a more articulate and convincing rationale for the introduction of international content course material in an already overcrowded curriculum. The second goal recognizes the recent emphasis on the need to provide a better fit between U.S. related ethnic concerns and the link to the "mother culture," as well as the variety of intergroup relations which occur on a worldwide scale. Both goals must be pursued simultaneously in order to assure that teacher preparation and instructional materials will help to extend the student's awareness of the world to include the traditions and current problems of those people who are entering more directly into their lives, while at the same time avoiding the possibility of submerging his own culture and values. One mechanism for achieving these goals could be a three-way collaborative relationship between the area studies programs and specialists, ethnic studies programs and specialists, and professional schools of education to cooperatively assess materials, develop new materials, and assist in teacher preparation. While the area approach may be considered passe by some, experience continues to demonstrate the viability of intelligently presenting teachers and students with accurate and meaningful information and experiences about regions of the world within the context of the multicultural needs of American students.

What emerges from all of this is a recognition that individuals trained in both ethnic studies and area studies have the opportunity to apply their skills to improving curricular content and instruction in the nation's schools and that,

indeed, many are now doing so. There is a very delicate relationship which must be established between ethnic studies, area/international studies and professional schools of education. This effort represents a fascinating challenge to those who have dedicated their careers to increasing knowledge of and attitudes toward cultural diversity, other nations, and interdependency. Moreover, the legislative and funding framework through multicultural education and "outreach" (NDEA VI) is already in existence.

Relationship to schooling: Collegiate level

At the collegiate level it is likely that both ethnic studies and area/international studies programs will continue to develop academic programs, community activities, publications and research that is specific to their own unique goals and objectives. However, some administrative patterns are now beginning to emerge in both ethnic studies programs and area studies programs that will allow cooperative efforts in a few important areas. Increasingly, ethnic studies centers are beginning to develop undergraduate and graduate (M.A.) degree programs. This move (encouraged, for example, by funding from the Ford Foundation) is an effort to respond to issues and problems identified over the past few years regarding the future viability of ethnic studies programs in American higher education. Questions have been raised in the following areas: what are viable career options/patterns for graduates in ethnic studies programs; what will be the relationship between ethnic studies and the numerous multicultural and bilingual programs currently being developed; is there a need for both an ethnic-specific approach and a problem approach to intergroup relations; what about joint (or articulated) degree programs between ethnic studies centers and professional schools; can ethnic studies centers also become qualified R & D centers for problems related to policy and practice in the intergroup arena?

With respect to many of these concerns, area studies programs have already sought solutions, have gained a fair amount of experience, and may be able to offer some viable models for ethnic studies centers to emulate. Career patterns for degree candidates in area studies programs have long been of concern to professionals in these fields. One innovative effort to confront this issue is the notion of joint or articulated degree programs (at UCLA the Latin American Center for example, has initiated such a program with several professional schools at the M.A. level). In a program of this type students acquire the area-specific skills (in-depth knowledge of a specific area and language) and combine these with a program of study in a professional school. In the Graduate School of Education at UCLA for example, students can be awarded a joint degree in curriculum and instruction with a focus on Latin America. This combination opens up dual career options in the field of Latin American Studies in general and in the area of curriculum development at both the collegiate and precollegiate levels. It now appears that some ethnic studies programs are also exploring the possibility of joint degrees. One of the persistent criticisms of degree programs in ethnic studies is that it is a dead-end curriculum. What does one do with a B.A. or M.A. in Asian-American Studies? The joint degree based on the model of the area studies centers might be one solution to this problem. A three-way cooperative effort between area studies programs, ethnic studies programs, and professional schools might result in some interesting variations on this theme. Degree requirements could be integrated, courses jointly developed and cross-listed, and a curriculum developed that would be academically sound and problem-oriented.

The arena of research and development offers another strong possibility for positive collaboration between these two fields of inquiry. Area studies centers have long been identified with strong research programs, indeed some would argue that they have been overly research oriented. Nevertheless, it is also becoming apparent that ethnic studies programs and centers are entering into research activities, fund-raising efforts, and publications programs. While it remains true that many of these research efforts will be either area or ethnic specific there may be just as many topics and issues that lend themselves to a collaborative effort. One problem in the past has been a psychological (perhaps artificial) distinction between area studies and ethnic studies. This division in perception seems to be changing and the possibility of cooperative research activities between ethnic and area studies centers is now very real. There are many examples but two will suffice to illustrate this point. At UCLA there is currently a joint effort underway between the Asian-American Studies Center and the East Asian Studies Center to research the impact that early Chinese immigration patterns had on regions in South China. The research will be conducted in China and has interesting implications for Chinese studies as well as for the study of Chinese-Americans. Another joint effort is in the planning stages between the Latin American Studies Centers and the Chicano Studies Center. The proposed topic is to study the border region between the United States and Mexico. The range of possibilities here is very large and covers urban, ecological, epidemiological and linguistic studies. This type of project not only cuts across area and ethnic lines but may involve individuals from various professional schools. It is an ideal example of the kind of interdisciplinary and cooperative effort that can develop between ethnic, area and professional studies. There are, of course, many other arenas of possible collaboration: curricular innovations, funding of joint proposals, sponsoring academic projects such as colloquia, exchanges of key staff, and so on. Obviously, the key to this kind of arrangement working is a mutual trust and respect for the academic and administrative integrity of each of the centers and programs. If this can be established then the only limitation on cooperative ventures in teaching, research, and community activities is the imagination and creativity that is applied to exploring these possibilities.

Finally, we might briefly make note of the issue of language and culture. Area studies centers have a long history of promoting the importance of the relationship between language learning and culture learning. The model most often followed is to combine study of the history and culture of a specific region with in-depth study of one or more of the appropriate languages. While the results of approach are still debated, many area studies scholars would agree that the study of language and culture are inextricably linked (a thorough analysis of this issue is available from the USOE sponsored Kittamugundi Conference on Uncommonly Taught Languages). It is precisely this relationship, however, that is causing so much concern among individuals in ethnic studies and multicultural/bilingual studies. One of the more frequently heard discussions revolves around those who are language specialists and are concerned with developing language competencies in bilingual programs, and those who believe the study of language apart from culture is meaningless. A recent conference I attended on bilingual/multicultural education literally showed the division between these two groups as the language teachers sat on one side of the room and the multicultural coordinators on the other. At the policy level, particularly with respect to K-12 curriculum reform, the pressure is on (at least in California and the Southwest) to integrate language and culture study. Ethnic studies centers, in collaboration with schools of education will have to

respond positively. Here is another area where the experiences and expertise of those in area studies centers can be utilized to assist program developments among ethnic studies centers.

Conclusion

The interrelationship between ethnic studies and international/area studies is only beginning to emerge as a viable option. It should be stressed that this is a two-way relationship, each assisting and enriching the other depending on the particular issue being explored. From what has been said in the preceding pages, four recommendations might be made to the Commission:

1. Efforts should be made to assist directors and program specialists from ethnic and international/area studies to meet in a cooperative and professional environment to discuss their own goals and objectives in order to identify those areas of overlap. This will be a first step in eliminating the psychological distance between these two fields and will also provide a forum for developing a mutual philosophical base for future cooperation.

2. Ethnic and international/area studies programs are already having an impact on curriculum, teacher education, and in-service teacher training at the precollegiate level (through multicultural and outreach programs respectively). Incentives could be provided that would enhance cooperation and collaboration where duplication of effort has been the norm.

3. At the collegiate level, international/area studies centers have much to offer ethnic studies centers in the area of degree development, undergraduate and graduate curriculum design, and the notion of joint degrees. Again, a forum to mutually discuss these problems would be desirable. Jointly funded research proposals would be another aspect of cooperation at the collegiate level. Current legislation for funding research in ethnic and international/area studies might be reassessed with this idea in mind.

4. Finally, more positive steps need to be taken to address the language and culture issue to assure that bilingual programs, language instruction, and ethnic and area studies are somewhat integrated in approach and application. It seems we are working at cross purposes, for example, when a teacher desiring training in bilingual education, takes courses in a Spanish department, finds the content irrelevant to the classroom situation, turns to Chicano studies for assistance and finds they have little contact with the Spanish department, and ends up in a Latin American Studies outreach in-service class on history and culture. This particular example is taken from a real experience and I have seen it repeated in the area of Asian-American studies.

These recommendations are but a few of the many that might be made. In my opinion, they represent topics and issues where interrelationships already exist and can be made stronger and more positive. It is a place to begin in an enterprise that holds great promise for the future.

List of Centers Contacted

Afro-American Studies Center, UCLA

Asian-American Studies Center, UCLA

Chicano Studies Center, UCLA

East Asian Studies Center, UCLA-USC

Latin American Studies Center, UCLA

Von Grunebaum Center for Near Eastern Studies, UCLA

Ethnic Studies Center, University of Hawaii

Chicano Studies Program, California State University, Long Beach

Chicano Studies Program, Loyola Marymount University

Chicano Studies Center, University of California, Santa Barbara

Asian-American Studies Center, University of California, Berkeley

INDIANA LANGUAGE PROGRAM AND WASHINGTON FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAM

Melvin J. Fox, Consultant, the Ford Foundation

The Indiana Language Program (ILP) and the Washington Foreign Language Program (WFLP) were efforts in the period 1962-1972 to improve foreign language teaching at all levels on a statewide basis. They were both funded almost entirely by the Ford Foundation. Other states demonstrated a determination to improve foreign language teaching in that period. However, none was as comprehensive, or as squarely centered in, and led by, the University or so well funded.

Background: Pre-1960. These interrelated programs exemplify the foreign language teaching situation in the United States in the decade of 1960, both the chaotic growth of activity and attempts to bring order and articulation into it. Thus they were as much directed at trying to blueprint a coordinated approach to the expansion of foreign language study that was already taking place at different elementary, secondary, and college levels, as they were to encouraging fundamental changes in the way foreign languages were taught or the way teaching of them was organized. Indeed though the ILP proclaimed that one of its objectives was "to bring about revolutionary changes," it was forced by the complex pressures and institutional rigidities that affect efforts to change curriculum to devote most of its resources to trying to strengthen and extend existing foreign language teaching activities, which was the declared goal of the WFLP.

Though the successful Russian launching of Sputnik in 1957 is generally regarded as the dramatic turning point in public and Congressional concern about the state of foreign language teaching, as it certainly was the event that set in motion concerns that led to the National Defense Education Act of 1958, there was increasing public concern about the teaching of foreign languages throughout the 1950's that led to relatively massive increases in the teaching of both modern world languages and certain of the less familiar languages that gained prominence during World War II.

In 1966 Cornell University established the First Division of Modern Languages, to deal with the teaching of foreign languages (and the science and pedagogy of teaching foreign languages) separately from literature, and appointed as director the head of the Army's intensive language program.*

There was growing acceptance of the audiolingual method of teaching foreign languages as it had been demonstrated with such dramatic effect under the Army Specialist Language Training Program during the War, and at the Division of Modern Languages. This placed emphasis on the priority importance of the spoken language, rather than the written word thereby setting off doctrinal as well as pedagogical questions about the methodology of teaching and

*As with most of the landmark developments in this field during that period, it was made possible by support from the Rockefeller Foundation.

learning foreign languages that have never been satisfactorily resolved. For one thing it created exaggerated expectations that could not be met because five indispensable factors responsible for the success of the Army's intensive method could not be replicated in secondary schools: sustained contact hours - up to 40 hours per week; concentration on language study to the exclusion of other subjects; extremely small classes; carefully selected and highly motivated students; relatively unlimited funds.

The staggering expansion of language laboratories required in the audio-lingual method represents one of the most extraordinary transformations in the history of American education, justifying the increasing use of the the term "audiolingual revolution." William Riley Parker reports* that there were 50 language laboratories in secondary schools in 1957 and 2000 in 1961. Use of language laboratories greatly accelerated after 1960: the final report on WFLP quotes the Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction for the state of Washington as stating in 1966 that "where once we had six hundred language labs in the state, now there are seven thousand." Indiana was one of the first universities to hold a conference (in 1959 in collaboration with Purdue) on the language laboratory. The installation of language laboratories, in turn, led to development on a massive scale of tapes, recordings, and ancillary listening and visual aids, and made necessary new instructional skills.

The Estes Park conference on The Role of Colleges and Universities in International Understanding was convened by the American Council of Education in June 1949 with sponsorship and support from sixty-nine national educational organizations and three foundations. The report of the conference commented for the first time on the desirability of "state-wide cooperation among the colleges and universities...to insure the adequacy and economy of language and area offerings..."** It is germane to this paper to note that Charles E. Odegaard, who was president of the University of Washington during the WFLP was a member of the Steering Committee for the conference, and Howard Lee Nostrand its Executive Secretary.*** James B. Conant was Chairman of the Executive Committee for the conference, and Earl J. McGrath, the U.S. Commissioner of Education an active ex officio member.

Television brought a new technology and methodology into the classroom. The Midwest program of Airborne Television Instruction (with Ford Foundation support) started in the late 1950's experimental efforts to bring units of

*In the 3rd edition of The National Interest and Foreign Languages, William Riley Parker, Department of State Publication 7324, September 1961.

**Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Edward W. Hazen Foundation, Social Science Foundation of the University of Denver.

***The Role of Colleges and Universities in International Understanding, Ed. by Howard Lee Nostrand and Francis J. Brown, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. 1949.

improved foreign language teaching into selected classrooms in the midwestern states, including Indiana; indeed in 1959 the Ford Foundation made a grant to Indiana University to assist in financing the preparation of television films for the teaching of foreign languages.

The nationwide expansion of the Foreign Languages in the Elementary School (FLES) Program, which was at its height during the 1950's stirred irreconcilable uncertainties and problems concerning such fundamental pedagogical questions as purposes for teaching foreign languages (to gain proficiency or expand the mind), the importance of sustained sequence of classes, difficulties of vertical articulation between educational levels, relation of foreign languages to other school subjects and imcompatability of rote learning required by the audiolingual method to the more intellectualizing, rule-based process of other subjects.

State foreign language supervisors multiplied from three in 1958 (Georgia, New Mexico, and New York) to 13 by 1960 (which may reflect reaction to Sputnik).

The U.S. Office of Education, starting with Earl J. McGrath in 1952, and greatly reinforced the following year by Oliver J. Caldwell, the Assistant Commissioner, vigorously endorsed the importance of increasing foreign language study in the schools, and in July 1956 appointed its first staff Specialist in Foreign Languages.*

In June 1952, the Modern Language Association of America (MLA) established (with Rockefeller Foundation funding) a Foreign Language Program to gather data nationally about the teaching of foreign languages to elementary and secondary school children and the training of foreign language teachers, and, in the process, to stir interest of both educators and scholars in the importance of foreign language teaching.

This program began "to reverse trends that, in previous years, had eroded the status of foreign languages in the eye of the public and in the schools" and to specify "directions for new materials and new strategies that would make foreign languages more productive for a wider range of students at all levels.** This work led to establishment of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) in response to the growing realization of needs teachers felt for a continuing national mechanism to explore general professional problems beyond those that were the concern of the AAT's (i.e., the American Association of Teachers of French, German, Spanish, etc.). The Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages provided such an annual forum starting in 1954.

Despite the greatly expanded need for foreign language teachers at all levels and the demanding changes in concepts, methodology, and materials

*Parker, op. cit.

**Foreign Language Study, Roger A. Pillet, University of Chicago Press, 1974.

(causing what one writer has defined as the battered teacher syndrome),* very few colleges or universities provided training in foreign language teaching: the qualifications required in most states before a teacher could obtain certification as a foreign language teacher typically had to be obtained in university modern language departments which focused on literature.

It was against this background of ferment, teacher uncertainties, unplanned expansion, conflict of purposes as between elementary and seconday schools, and secondary schools and colleges and universities, that Indiana University at the beginning of the 1960's and the University of Washington toward the middle of the decade undertook to establish at the University a center for mounting a comprehensive statewide attack to improve and increase the teaching of foreign languages in the schools.

Factors That Led to ILP and WFLP: The ILP and the WFLP had several fundamental background features in common - features that related to national, state, and university posture toward the teaching of foreign languages. Following are the major factors that led to the emergence of the two programs and laid strong bases for their success.

- Post World War II concern about the desultory level of student interest and demand, and foreign language teaching resources in elementary and secondary schools, was mounting nationally throughout the 1950's. By 1957, when Sputnik sparked a firestorm of activity designed to strengthen secondary school instruction in mathematics, the sciences, and foreign languages, efforts to improve and expand foreign language teaching in schools in Indiana and Washington had been increasing. Professor William Riley Parker of Indiana was a principle architect of the NDEA. One important result of his work at the national level at MLA and in connection with the NDEA was a realization that intensive, coordinated work on foreign language teaching within each state was a precondition for effective national improvement. Thus after returning to Indiana in the early 1960's he headed a special task force that reviewed the state of foreign language teaching throughout Indiana, and the type of leadership the University could and should give to improve it. Parker's committee drew up a ten-year program which became the basis of a request to the Ford Foundation by President Herman B. Wells. There had been comparable concern and development at the University of Washington under the leadership of Professor Howard L. Nostrand, who continues to work to implement the Estes Park Recommendation, and who was closely linked with the MLA Foreign Language Program, and, after 1962, with the example set by the ILP; Nostrand was a member of a three-person out-of-state team that evaluated the ILP in February 1965, seven months before the WFLP was launched.

- In both universities there was university-wide inter-departmental awareness of the problem and leadership from language specialists with national reputations, as well as strong support from the office of the

*The Context of Foreign Language Teaching, by Leon Jacobovitz and Barbara Gordon, Newbury House, 1974.

President. Additionally, in both States the leadership potential of the university for implementation of long-range plans for improvement was recognized and accepted by influential educators: e.g., since 1960 the University of Washington had maintained a Bureau of School Service and Research which, among other activities, convened an annual conference of high school principals and counsellors; and Indiana had established Coordinators in selected subjects (to which foreign languages was added in late 1961 in anticipation of the ILP) to work in an advisory capacity with schools throughout the State faced with the need to adopt new curricula in the natural and physical sciences and in mathematics.

- Both programs had strongly committed leadership which brought not only expert qualifications and experience to their planning and day-to-day direction, but missionary zeal as well.

- Both States were closely involved with national professional bodies, such as MLA, and the Northeast Conference on Foreign Language Teaching, and the Advisory Council on The Teaching of Foreign Language (ACTFL) that were actively concerned with the problem.

- Both states had State supervisors of Foreign Language Instruction and Advisory Committees on Foreign Languages (in the State of Washington it was a sub-committee of the Advisory Committee to Supervisor of State Department of Public Instruction) in which university language specialists as well as school and district administrators and teachers from public and private high schools, junior and community colleges, and universities, participated.

- The NDEA was getting into full swing by the time both programs were launched providing strong reinforcement for the teacher-training objectives of the ILP and WFLP through summer institutes, support of training conferences and workshops, and support of research on the problems of teaching and learning of foreign languages. A principal goal of WFLP was to increase capacities in the State to take fullest advantage of resources being made available by NDEA.

- Both programs had ample funding that permitted use of almost any means to promote program objectives through conferences, incentive travel and study grants, direct counselling, teacher training, publications.

Description of the ILP and WFLP

The ILP and the WFLP shared similar objectives: to improve recruitment and training of teachers of foreign languages; to improve and expand elementary and secondary teaching of foreign languages; to strengthen university resources for serving the needs of school systems and teachers, through direct counselling of teachers and supervisors, through workshops and conferences, and advisory services at various levels; to write teaching materials for certain of the less well-known languages (Japanese, Chinese, Norwegian and Russian in the case of the WFLP; Chinese, Arabic, Japanese, Korean in the case of the ILP); to develop long-term strategies for the improvement of teaching of foreign languages: there was agreement that the most important precondition for long-term improvement of foreign language teaching was sustained sequencing that could

assure improved vertical articulation within and between school districts, and between school systems and colleges, and horizontal articulation between languages and other subjects; to strengthen ties between state educational organizations, and between state and national associations concerned with foreign language teaching. The WFLP was also interested in defining language proficiency goals for high school, and developing competency and diagnostic tests that could be made part of the Washington Pre-college Testing Program.

The ILP expended grant funds totalling $1,046,354 over a period of eleven years, starting in March 1962. The WFLP expended grant funds totalling $684,502 over a period of six years starting in September 1965.

The purpose of the ILP was to establish a service operation* at Indiana University that would use every possible means to "completely change"** foreign language teaching at elementary, secondary, college, and university levels throughout the state and so alter attitudes of the public toward foreign languages that by the end of a decade, i.e., "by 1972 modern foreign-language instruction with modern methods and objectives (would be available) in every high school in Indiana, with an increasing number of schools offering four years of such instruction, and with every college boy or girl counselled to study foreign language, ancient or modern for as long as possible."*** The varied activities under the ILP were divided into pre-service and in-service programs. Pre-service programs related to teaching by non full-time language teachers (as in the case of elementary school teachers, or student teaching interns), or to activities that were preparing teachers to become professional language teachers. The principal foci of the pre-service program were the FLES (Foreign Language in Elementary School) Program; Summer study programs for high school honor students (continuing a program originally funded by Carnegie Corporation and directed by a former staff member of the Foundation's ITR Program); incentive training scholarships for potential foreign language teachers.

In-service programs applied to all activities related directly to instructional practices or content, involving people employed as foreign language teachers or as administrators, supervisors or other personnel professionally concerned with school foreign language programs. In-service activities included institutes, seminars, conferences and workshops in all parts of the state, lasting from a few days, to 6 to 8 week summer programs for teachers. Some were designed to deal with administrative and organizational problems, some related to individual foreign languages, some were regional within the state often carried out in cooperation with other universities or educational associations in Indiana, or in collaboration with national organizations like

*Under the guidance of the already established State Advisory Committee for Foreign Language, and using the already established office of Coordinator for School Foreign Languages as the staging area within the University.

**Original proposal

***Original proposal

the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). In-service activities also provided summer travel scholarships to enable teachers to undertake intensive language study abroad, development of special teaching materials and instructional aids including how to use programmed instruction and language laboratories.

The ILP had an extensive counselling program which provided direct assistance to weaker schools, teaching demonstrations in strategically located areas of the State; advisory assistance to both teachers and supervisory personnel; in an effort through direct contact, to build communication ties with all foreign language teachers in the State, and to make appropriate personal contact with those educational managers in the state who shape policy on foreign language teaching, including supervisors, administrators, members of Boards of Education, curriculum planners, guidance personnel.

The ILP conceived of its mission as educational in the broadest sense with respect to teachers and administrators at all levels, and students of all ages, and therefore devoted considerable resources to a long list of publications that were distributed throughout the state, and, in some cases, nationally (e.g., An Annotated Bibliography for Integrated FLES Teaching Materials; Foreign Language in Indiana; Language Laboratory Teaching; Translating Foreign Languages into Careers; A Blueprint for Greater Foreign Language Teaching Articulation.) In addition the ILP published two newsletters, Flesling, which comprised three issues sent to the 350 FLES personnel in Indiana in 1966-67; and Dialog, sent from 5 to 8 times a year to over two thousand foreign language teachers in elementary and secondary schools in Indiana as well as college teachers.

Purpose of the WFLP. Whereas the ILP set out to achieve radical change in concepts, methods and materials, the WFLP believed it could achieve its objectives by working through existing instrumentalities and programs. Like the ILP, the WFLP operated under a Board of Advisors which in the case of the WFLP was made up of representatives from the University's Departments of Romance, Slavic, Scandinavian, Germanic, and Asian Languages and Literature, Classics, the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Education, the Bureau of School Services. Additionally, the Supervisor of Foreign Language Programs in the Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the Superintendent of Schools, and the Coordinator of Foreign Languages for the Shoreline District in Seattle were represented.

The WFLP used methods similar to ILP to carry out its purposes.

State, regional, and local conferences of administrators, counsellors, teacher trainers and teachers concerned with teaching foreign languages, writing new materials, or developing curricular strategies in the school systems and community colleges were held for four general purposes; (a) to enable administrators in the Office of Public Instruction and in other parts of the school system to learn what teachers considered the priority problems and feasible remedies; (b) to help teachers obtain perspective about the problems of other teachers in other school districts, and in other parts of the nation; (c) to examine

and discuss pedagogical problems and increase and gain sense of a common professional approach to them; (d) to enable the WFLP to learn about the trouble spots, and the points and people of strength, in foreign language teaching in the state, and create awareness about WFLP among those concerned with foreign language teaching.

Eight demonstration classes were organized to illustrate the feasibility of introducing such rarely taught languages as Swedish, Japanese, Russian, Chinese, and Norwegian at the secondary level, as well as to stimulate the interest of the relevant ethnic groups in the state to study their cultural heritage. New teaching materials were developed in Russian, Japanese, and Chinese. Ten pilot classes were set up in different school districts for the purpose of testing and assessing standard offerings in French, German, Spanish, and Latin; three each in French, German, and Spanish (at the elementary and middle school levels), and one in Latin (for the secondary level) and improving sequencing and articulation. The district agreed to plan four-year sequences and the WFLP agreed to provide (a) 25% of a teacher's salary for four years in each sequence provided the same teacher stayed with one group of students for four years and (b) advice, guidance, and some materials. A Coordinator for each language component in the pilot classes was appointed from the appropriate language department at the University. These demonstrations and pilot classes were considered by the managers of the program to be the major WFLP effort relating to secondary schools.

As with the ILP, teacher training was an important focus both to increase competence and improve motivation of language teachers through overseas travel, research grants, opportunities for observation of programs in other school districts and other states, and testing innovative classroom use of videotape, film, closed circuit television, or recording tapes.

Intercommunication with language associations in the state (e.g., the Washington Association of Foreign Language Teachers, the Washington State Council for FLES, the Council of Puget Sound Foreign Language Teachers) and in the country as a whole (e.g., the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages and the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) was an important goal. As with the ILP, certain of the WFLP conferences and workshops were jointly carried out with national organizations.

Several special surveys were completed of teacher training in the State and attitudes of foreign language teachers, of FLES programs in selected districts, of enrollment statistics for the state for the period 1965-1971. In addition surveys were carried out on the foreign language backgrounds and attitudes of Principals in secondary schools in Washington, and of the course assignments of foreign language teachers. A study was also made of the loss of foreign language competency of college students.

Dissemination of information about foreign language teaching, was a priority concern, and one of the most successful components of the WFLP. The Newsletter, a monthly publication, became the second largest foreign language newsletter in the United States, reaching a circulation of 2500. In addition a number of the proceedings of conferences resulted in publications, and textbooks resulted from the work on demonstration and pilot classes.

One component of the WFLP differed from ILP: proficiency testing. Two programs were developed: (a) a pilot-class testing program attempted to define levels of proficiency to be attained each year of the four-year sequences, and to assess the effect of four years of continuous instruction with one teacher; (b) a foreign language test was developed for the Washington Pre-College Testing Program to be taken along with its mathematics and English tests by all college-bound secondary school seniors.

As in the case of ILP problems relating to horizontal integration of foreign language courses, long-term sequencing of courses, and articulation between various education levels proved to be the major concerns of the WFLP.

Assessment

Achievements. With respect to the language teaching improvement and expansion goals of the two projects, the results were quite general and, more recent history suggests, ephemeral. Indeed Ms. Lorraine Strasheim, who had been director of ILP, and currently serves as coordinator of School Foreign Language Programs at Indiana University recently told the writer that the principal outcome of the program (beside establishment of her office - a major achievement) was finding out by the end of the program the facts about teachers, students, schools, curriculum planning, sequencing, articulation that were needed at the beginning to achieve projected objectives - by which time conditions for pursuing the objectives had fundamentally altered. The final WFLP report stated: "The most significant and lasting influence of the WFLP will probably be the local and individual teachers and teachers' organizations that benefitted from its assistance and counsel. In promoting, and in some cases establishing, better communication between the state's universities and colleges on the one hand and the public schools on the other, the WFLP served to raise the professional awareness of foreign language teachers at all levels and helped to lay the foundations for intelligent and autonomous growth within the changing framework of educational theory and practise".

The concrete achievements were as follows:

(1) Continuation by Indiana University of the office of Coordinator of School Foreign Language Programs, the director of which is funded by the university to continue the ILP's statewide counselling service is a direct outcome of the ILP.

(2) At the University of Washington the Board of Advisers of the WFLP became first a Foreign Language Council, subsequently assuming its current name of Council on Language Learning. Initially under the chairmanship of the director of the WFLP, it was an interdepartmental committee charged to improve the structure, quality, and interrelationship of the teaching of languages at the University. Though armed with funds for research and training this Council is concerned more with the cultural aspects of languages than with language arts, and is clearly in the interest of the university rather than the school systems of the state.

(3) The educational activities, carried out through conferences, workshops, symposia, and through direct consultation with teachers, educators and administrators at all levels substantially raised consciousness of the importance of foreign languages, even among parents. They also increased awareness of problems relating to teacher capacities and responsibilities, sequencing difficulties, integration with other demanding parts of the school curriculum, articulation between various levels, and costs for carrying out innovation in foreign language teaching.

(4) The programs achieved expansion of teaching of foreign languages in secondary school, including several of the uncommon languages, as well as a momentary spurt in focus on FLES. ILP data are illustrative:

(No. of Students, Grades 7 - 12)

	French	German	Spanish
1962-63	7,537	4,843	26,277
1968-69	35,019	15,746	46,721

(5) The awareness throughout Indiana and Washington of the resources that the university had available for improving foreign language teaching was greatly heightened.

(6) Materials for teaching the major foreign languages, as well as several of the uncommon ones, were improved.

(7) Linkage and communication between and among foreign language teachers and educational administrators within the state was greatly increased, as were the ties of those in the state responsible for foreign language teaching with national scholarly and professional organizations. This led to significant enhancement of the sense of professionalism among such specialists in each State.

Failures

The most fundamental failure of both programs was inability to develop vigorous, self-sustaining university-based foreign language service programs. Both the ILP and WFLP were labor-intensive in the sense that a sustained, unremitting effort by program staff was required to keep up momentum of both the intra-university monitoring and reinforcement, and the activities throughout the state. Both institutions found that they had to apply over 50% of the funds for personnel related to the project, even to the point of providing incentive subsidies for school teachers to undertake experimental programs - a cost not anticipated when the grant was made. These salaries were not picked up in either Washington or Indiana by the legislature, the university, or locally. Thus when the Foundation grant funds terminated most of the activities ceased that the project personnel had kept alive and in motion. More specifically the programs failed to encourage sustained student interest in foreign languages, to lengthen sequences or develop vertical or horizontal articulation of foreign language classes, or to improve teacher training.

(1) The ILP was not successful in sustaining increases in enrollments of secondary school students in foreign language classes: the percentage of the 9th year through 12th year student population in foreign languages increased from 17.2% in 1958-59 to 30.2% in 1968-69, but declined steadily thereafter to 22.2% in 1977-78.

(2) Problems of longer sequencing, particularly the considerable efforts to bolster programming in elementary schools were not solved; by the end of both projects FLES was rapidly deteriorating. (At its peak in the late 1960's there were 40 FLES programs in over 300 elementary schools in Indiana; today there are a handful of programs for gifted or exceptional children). Nor were attempts at longer term sequencing of secondary programs successful as illustrated by the following figures for modern foreign languages from the ILP:

Year	Level	Number Enrolled	Attrition Rate and % Reduction from Previous Year
1967-68	1	41,365	-
1968-69	2	28,496	31%
1969-70	3	8,795	69%
1970-71	4	2,825	68%

In 1971 as both projects were terminating, the attrition rate from grade 9 to grade 10 was continuing to increase at the rate of 1.5% per year. Seven years later, according to a report of Lorraine Strasheim enrollments in both grades were continuing to decline. Of the 22.2% of the total 9-12 student population that were enrolled in foreign languages, 43% dropped out after one year of study. ("Overview of Foreign Language Education in the United States"; paper presented by Ms. Strasheim to President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, December 12, 1978). Ms. Strasheim suggests that the fact that Indiana's attrition rate in the second year is less than that of the U.S. average (50%) is due to the ILP.

(3) Articulation between levels, or between elementary, secondary, and college/university, fared little better. The difficulties of relating either the course offerings at different levels, or knowledge of the language/culture, with attainment of an oral command of the language were as great in 1972 as in 1962, and continue to be as intractable today.

(4) Inter-relation, or integration, with other parts of the school curriculum which is indispensable for both long-term sequencing and improved articulation was not measurably improved but was probably made more difficult by the campaign both projects waged for more class and teacher time for foreign languages.

(5) The approach to learning languages changed very little at the university level: the emphasis in university language departments continued to be on literature and history, rather than language, and the teaching of courses likely to be taken by people working toward certification as foreign language teachers remained largely in the hands of either junior language department members or with graduate students, neither of which were equipped to offer linguistic or language skills that teachers needed in a school classroom. This

continues to be true: "the teacher too frequently emerges from his or her training with a major in the language but no real skills or proficiency in the language". (recent unpublished report by Ms. Strasheim). The WFLP final report stated "In September 1970... no courses were offered expressly for foreign language teachers; beginning teachers in need of credits to satisfy the fifth year requirement of Washington State certification were obliged to take frequently irrelevant courses in literature or literary study, and experienced teachers could find no courses in pedagogy or 'methods' relevant to their professional development".

(6) Neither program achieved a solid and sustainable academic base for the coordinating program that permitted the shifting of personnel slots and other costs to the regular "hard" university budget. There were initial advantages in having the support and promotional support of the President's office. However, because of the academic culture, and the structure and budgetary process of the university, long-term survival in the university requires the equivalent of departmental sponsorship. The personnel of the WFLP was disbanded at the termination of Foundation funding, and the director is currently associate professor of Romance Languages and Literature. Though the post of Coordinator for School of Foreign Languages was continued at Indiana, the post is under the Dean of Faculties (i.e., in effect the Office of the President) and continues therefore to lack an academic base. Thus on balance though both projects achieved general consciousness-raising about the educational importance of foreign languages, they fell substantially short of their specific objectives.

Non-Project Reasons for Deficiencies. The reasons for the failures in both programs lie more in the changing setting for the teaching and study of foreign languages in the schools and colleges, than in deficiencies that can be attributed to the two projects and their leadership. The causes of failure thus are relevant for consideration of strategies for long-term strengthening of the place and role of foreign languages in the school curriculum. Before summarizing several of the lessons that might be learned from these two programs, and indeed before those lessons can have full meaning or operational effectiveness, it is desirable to summarize ten factors in the setting as it was changing in the late 1960's and early 1970's, that undermined attainment of those specific goals of the projects that related to: increasing numbers of schools teaching, and the population of students enrolled in foreign languages; development of longer teaching sequences and more sustained student interest; achieving better articulation between educational levels; improving classroom methods and teacher effectiveness; and broadening the foreign language base by introducing several of the rarely taught languages.

(1) The petering out of the Sputnik scare by the late 1960's coincided with budgetary stringencies at State and local levels. According to the Indiana report this forced a "turn around in priorities and interests of the foreign language fraternity." Teaching programs were severely affected by cuts made in a sudden, helter-skelter, rather than in a planned, phased way. Additionally, this severely curtailed innovation or changes. A report on the Indiana program states that in early 1970 a teacher in a southern Indiana community expressed the fear that "to suggest that there are needed changes in our language program just might result in its cancellation." Other factors mentioned below made foreign languages peculiarly vulnerable to cut-backs in programming of school curriculum.

(2) The demand by communities, parents, and legislatures for accountability began to erode foreign language teaching in two respects: a) high expectations with respect to the audiolingual teaching method began creating demands for evidence of teaching effectiveness; and b) school systems began to mandate that classes had to have a certain minimum of students to warrant continuance - 15 in Indiana. Both factors had a disastrous effect on efforts to develop long-term sequencing.

(3) Students began to lose interest in foreign languages for a variety of reasons:

- colleges and universities were continuing to relax their language requirement for admittance;

- the disullusionment with the audiolingual method increased for three reasons: it did not achieve the instant or easily-acquired language competence students anticipated; it was, as a teaching and learning method, antithetical to the erupting student concern for social relevance, subject-matter content, and personal involvement; it was not consistent with the shift with respect to the study of language from teaching to learning;

- "released time" work programs that were part of the growing effort to respond to special needs of underprivileged took precedence over academic courses, (and in some areas fatally reduced numbers in all advanced classes);

- the need for language credits for graduation from secondary school continued to diminish;

- proliferation of electives at all levels made it easy for students to substitute for foreign languages;

- faced with increasing attrition in second, third, and fourth year courses, foreign language teachers were forced to try to crowd more and more into shortened sequences, and to handle multi-level classes, with the result of further diminishing achievement by students of language skills, especially of oral competence.

(4) Foreign language teachers became increasingly disillusioned and disaffected for the following reasons: (a) Student impatience with the audiolingual method caused a shift from teacher-controlled to pupil-centered instruction, which stresses an individualized approach to language teaching. The final WPLF report states: "...from 1968 on, faced with student demands for relevancy and a more personal teaching style, as well as the recognition of the limits of audiolingualism as the 'universal' method, the foreign language teaching profession...began to stress the development of individual techniques and a personal approach to students." (b) The steady defeat in efforts toward longer-term sequencing that teachers considered essential for effective teaching (as James B. Conant emphatically did in his well publicized study of teachers in 1963: "unless four years of instruction are offered in the high schools

it might better be eliminated entirely"*) left teachers caught on a treadmill of first and second year courses from which students expected miraculous results, if not instant success. (c) As attrition after the first year increased, as well as demands for a minimum number of students to justify separate classes, foreign language teachers were forced to take several levels in one class, and even to teach other subjects; multilevel classes in a single class period plus responsibilities in two disciplines made it difficult for teachers to shift methods to a more individualized approach to language teaching, and one book on foreign language teaching ("The Context of Foreign Language Teaching" by Leon Jakobovitz and Barbara Gordon, Newbury House, 1974) refers to the "battered language teacher", the BALT syndrome, as a principal factor in undermining the teaching of foreign languages in the schools.

(5) In light of the above it is not surprising that the interest of prospective teachers in foreign language teaching as a profession began to decline by the end of the 1960's. This tendency was reinforced by the shrinkage in job opportunities caused by cut-backs and doubling up in classes and the increased tenuring of foreign language teachers: 90% of the foreign language teaching profession in Indiana holds certification that guarantees their job until retirement. The drying up of job opportunities was already becoming visible in 1971 (Ninth Annual Report of ILP): "IU placed only 44.5% of French teacher candidates; 37.5% of Russian; 40% of German, 30.2% of Spanish."

(6) With the decimation of classes in certain of the primary years a conflict emerged between the primary and secondary systems - the latter wanting to cut back primary school teaching of foreign languages in order to justify better concentration, and sequencing and, incidentally, larger teaching staffs, at the secondary level. Similar conflicts developed between secondary teachers and college professors, thus destroying all efforts, and pretense, toward articulation, interaction, and common purposes which it became apparent had increased largely through forced-feeding under both programs. For the first time in two decades the objectives of the college professors and the school foreign language teacher were not related; removing the college entrance requirement pulled out the linch-pin that previously had made articulation and communication both necessary and feasible.

(7) Student and racial unrest, at times coinciding in both Indiana and Washington in the late 1960's, further eroded both teacher and student interest in foreign languages, by causing occasional closing of schools and disruption of classroom contact hours that is indispensable to the audiolingual method. The final WFLP report in asserting that "much of the ...work to define levels of language proficiency in the pilot class testing program appears to have been wasted" cites the following reasons:

- The incursion into Cambodia occurred just before the major pilot testing of students who were in no mood for such an academic exercise.

*Education of American Teachers, James B. Conant, McGraw Hill, 1963.

- The Kent State shooting happened about the same time.

- Students regarded the test as irrelevant and an imposition.

- They also considered it quite irrelevant to their lives and interests, and thus in doing the tests they functioned considerably below their capacities.

(8) Budget cuts greatly increased the importance of local-specific factors to the point that "teaching problems have become so intensely localized that even regional groupings (i.e. conferences) do not serve as they once did." (ILP report, August, 1971). Long-range planning that is essential to achieve sound and productive scheduling and articulation of foreign language in a school or a district proved increasingly impossible. Paradoxically, the severest strains were in urban rather than rural schools as the budgetary situation of the cities worsened in the late 1960's. The Basic Education Bill of the State of Washington, approved in 1976 had nothing to say about State responsibility for the teaching of foreign languages in the schools, and only in 1979 is being amended to recognize that foreign languages are an important part of the school curriculum.

(9) Gains made in integrating or interrelating foreign language teaching with other parts of the students' schedule were undermined by the increase of pressures mentioned above and the weakened position of foreign languages in the curriculum. Intercommunication that had begun to be developed between the foreign language school teachers and their school-teaching colleagues, and between them and members of university departments of language and literature, began to decline. Competitive tensions between foreign language teachers and other school teachers increased, and doctrinal antagonisms between school language teachers and the university community of language/literature specialists were reawakened.

(10) During the last half of the 1960's, bilingual language programs were developing a powerful thrust, particularly in states with large linguistic and ethnic minorities. NDEA recognized the problem faced by non-native speakers of English by sponsoring two summer institutes in 1964 for training teachers of English as a second language. In the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 the federal government established the right of children of non-English speaking parents to receive instruction in their mother tongues. This new dimension greatly increased the pressures in the foreign language teaching sector, and led the managers of the WFLP to the conclusion by 1969 that "if significant...progress were to be made in the improvement of foreign language instruction, experimentation and research, entirely new instructional models would prove more suitable than simply stengthening traditional practices..." Toward this end the Advisory Board authorized creation of a bilingual elementary school. Though this project never attracted outside funding, the teaching of certain foreign languages, plus English as a second language gained secure footing with both federal and State support in the school systems under the increasingly political banner of bilingualism, and added considerably new complexity to the foreign language sector. Additionally, according to the WFLP report, the rapidly growing impor-

tance and acceptance of English as the major language of world business, trade, and diplomacy had reinforced the declining interest in foreign languages. To the extent this does affect the priority given to foreign languages by students and school systems, it continues to be a matter of major importance because the international use of English and the acceptance of its importance has been increasing exponentially since 1970.

Conclusion

Of the many lessons to be learned from the decade of efforts by these two projects to reform foreign language teaching, six stand out as relevant for planning future strategies for improvement in this sector of education.

Foreign language teaching cannot be reformed or transiormed as a separate discipline or curriculum component. It certainly cannot be expanded except as part of an integrated plan for rescheduling and reprogramming curriculum. Both projects demonstrated that efforts to do so can be counterproductive by stirring up competitive antagonisms among teachers of other subjects and restrictive reactions among administrators, that are intensified when inevitable budgetary pressures arise. Similarly, the linguistic aspects of language learning -- whether through the audiolingual or some other method -- must be balanced by relation of language learning to other curriculum. Current efforts by foreign language teachers to join the movement for "global education" as a framework for study of foreign language is a recognition of this fact, and a conscious effort to make allies out of teachers concerned with social studies, history, and other subjects concerned with other societies and cultures.

General national, or even state, strategies for foreign language teaching are unworkable, unless adapted to local conditions. Many factors that create and sustain differentials between school districts must be taken into account in the shaping of particular plans and programming for teaching foreign languages: student interest, motivation and numbers; the competence of teachers, and their total teaching and administrative responsibilities; community support; extra-curricular activities of both students (e.g., work-release programs) and teachers; financial factors. One cannot base teaching or programming strategies solely on "the counting of heads" (which according to Ms. Strasheim was one of the fatal flaws in the ILP -- a weakness the WFLP tried to reduce by initial conferences to learn teacher perceptions of the actual situation) but must be responsive to needs assessment, work loads of teachers, scope and sequencing of language programs in relation to other subjects.

Outside funding cannot by-pass or overcome these fundamental differences in educational conditions and environments. The mixed results of NDEA Institutes reinforced the evidence produced by the ILP and WFLP that "soft" or external funding and the extra (and sometimes extraneous) resources they buy cannot replace the organic growth that can be achieved only through the regular sources of school budgeting. The fundamental importance of assuring a closer relationship between local funding resources and activities related to changing curriculum was underscored by the enormous relative cost of both programs, and the impossibility of shifting most of the activities funded with grant funds to regular state or local budgets.

Curricular change and innovation cannot be achieved through individual teachers, but only institutionally through schools. One of the major weaknesses of ILP was the decision to use individual highly motivated teachers as the "change agents." The ILP thereby not only missed 65% of the foreign language teachers but failed to carry their schools and districts or to sustain commitments made by certain schools, when the going became rough.

Missionary zeal, particularly if outside the school system, can be counterproductive with respect to curricular innovation. One of the ILP reports (1972) states: "Part of the problem has stemmed from the fact that the Program and Advisory Committees had always led the teachers and it took time to develop a perspective which would permit the teachers to take the lead in defining their needs."

Perhaps the most important lesson conclusively demonstrated by both projects, was the fact that the university is not the soundest place from which to try to influence innovation in foreign language teaching in the schools. An exaggerated notion inevitably developed in both programs of how much university-based leadership could achieve through its conferences, workshops, extension workers, publications, and moral support. The fact that realignment of curriculum priorities and of teaching programs could be achieved only by school systems at local levels tended to be overlooked. There are at least four reasons why the school system must be the center of gravity for changes that involve sustained funding of new curriculum, the planning and programming of curriculum, the professional factors affecting careers of teachers, the perceived interests of students.

(a) Even with an active, highly peripatetic Coordinator of School Foreign Languages, or a Bureau of School Service and Research, and close ties with the Department of Public Instruction, the members of the faculty at the University cannot be in close enough contact with the educational problems of the schools to effectively prescribe for them, and the realities of their own academic culture, and their career imperatives, fundamentally limit their becoming interested in or involved with school problems on a sufficiently continuous basis. A coordinator has to spend as much time sustaining the interest and effort of university colleagues as in nurturing and nursing interest in the schools. This limitation extends to the training of foreign language teachers at the university which continues to be carried out for the most part in terms of the academic culture rather than the realities of the educational environment in the school or the needs of or classroom responsibilities of the teacher.

(b) The teacher's career development, opportunities for advancement, and requirements for professional recognition center in school systems not universities or academic disciplines. .

(c) The professional associations of importance to the teacher, whether at the state or national levels, do not have strong or significant ties to universities, and their concerns are not strongly academic. Bilingualism and English as a second language has brought new teachers and new constituencies into the foreign language sector of school systems, creating a need for new professional alliances - as persuasively recommended by James E. Alatis, Secretary of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (Language in American Life, Georgetown University, 1978).

(d) The complex economic realities of school education make it imperative for school systems to nurture ties to the educational, social, political, and financial sources of their sponsorship and continuing support - the community, the state legislatures and departments of education, the U.S. Office of Education.

The continuance of the Coordinator of School Foreign Language Programs as an information, counselling and service center by Indiana University is made possible (i.e., tolerated by the school systems) by the University by recognition of the fact that school systems are the center of gravity for planning and funding curriculum development, and that the role of the university is to respond to the initiative of the schools.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING IN THE SCHOOLS -- 1979
FOCUS ON METHODOLOGY

Helen P. Warriner
Associate Director for Languages
Virginia Department of Education

INTRODUCTION AND PERTINENT HISTORY

During most of the first century of public education in the United States, secondary schools existed almost exclusively to prepare a relatively small number of young people, most of whom were men, to enter the college or university. The institutions of higher education considered a reading knowledge of one or more classical or modern languages to be the hallmark of the educated man, to use the sexist language of that period; and the oral skills and even writing received little emphasis in the instructional programs. High schools, given their mission of college preparation at that time, directed their efforts to the same goals.

World War II brought change. Its most immediate effect was that of a pall of negativism that fell over foreign language instruction. It became somehow unpatriotic to study the language of our enemies; and German, for example, which had been offered by some schools, all but disappeared from the curriculum. Other languages were scarcely considered more worthy of study. Our involvement in the war, however, made some of our military and political leaders aware of the fact that such an attitude was a short-sighted one, that we needed to be able to communicate in other languages for our own welfare and defense. Two results occurred. The Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP), which had responsibility for teaching languages to military personnel for defense applications, began to influence how foreign languages were taught in the schools. Oral comprehension and speaking became important for the first time in our history. The thrust was slow but persistent. It was not until 1958 and the legislation of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) that national focus and financial support were directed to foreign language instruction. The NDEA was the second outcome of World War II to affect foreign language instruction; it gave momentum to the ASTP influences.

By the early 1960's, the World War II developments just cited had ignited the torch of revolution for foreign language teaching in the United States. It was the audiolingual revolution. Although most of us today would express some disappointments in regard to its impact, few of us would deny that it had far-reaching influence. That revolution has rarely been thoroughly analyzed and evaluated. On the one hand, it was a pedagogical and technological revolution that, for example, popularized the language laboratory and replaced vocabulary lists with dialogues and translation exercises with pattern drills. That is what most people think of when they reminisce about the audiolingual period. On the other hand, and more important but less discussed, it was a revolution in philosophy. It changed the objectives from that of preparation for reading to the practical applications of all four skills--listening, speaking, reading, and writing--and made the study of culture more comprehensive and pragmatic. In the philosophical realm, the revolution was resoundingly successful. Almost no one today disagrees with the four-skill philosophy. We introduce every curriculum guide with it. We plan our workshops and title our books with some aspect of it. It prefaces the foreign language

course listings in almost every college catalogue. We almost unanimously subscribe to the four-skill philosophy in form although not necessarily in substance.

Many strides were made in the methodological aspects of the revolution, but the results were not nearly so great in this domain as were the philosophical ones. We changed the textbooks so radically and sometimes so naively that some were hardly recognizable as textbooks any more, and many teachers did not know what to do with them. NDEA institutes taught participants to orchestrate pattern drills and to use minimal pairs, but not nearly enough teachers were retrained through this excellent opportunity. Administrators bought us language labs, but we did not always know how to use them to advantage. Excitement nevertheless prevailed for a few years until a natural process set in. To every action there is a reaction. To every left stroke of the pendulum there is a right stroke. To every revolution there is a counter-revolution or at least a loss of momentum. Such happened to the developments in foreign language education. NDEA money ran out, and opportunities for retraining ceased. It was hard to teach using the strange new books. It wasn't easy for publishers to sell books that teachers didn't know how to use. And it takes decades to change the college curriculum, so we never significantly revamped teacher preparation. Furthermore, how was one to follow a Nelson Brooks or a William Riley Parker at the podium and get the profession's ear without taking issue with what they had said? So we learned to argue, and we regressed. At national meetings and in our journals, we began to attack each other or to propose new theories, methods, or approaches which were often advocated to be panaceas for audiolingual weaknesses or flaws. The spirit of revolution died, and confusion set in.

In the vacuum, textbook publishers began to offer us books that incorporated the "best of the audiolingual and traditional approaches." They attempted to unite divergent philosophies and schools of methodology, but, like oil and water, divergent philosophies do not blend. We bought the books, nevertheless, for many of us, never having been trained in audiolingual methodology, were tired of struggling to do something we were not prepared for. Such a trend initiated the era of eclecticism which supposedly embraced any methods that led to the achievement of the goals, but which, if we really want to be honest about it, resulted in an excuse to slip back into the comfortable routine of teachers talking, students listening, texts occupying the constant attention of both, and little language proficiency developing. Many teachers allowed this to happen.

At about the same time, some of the spokespeople for the profession singled out specialized approaches to advocate. Each school of thought perhaps had some validity, but the totality of all of them resulted in focus on tangential rather than on basic issues. We got individualization, humanization, interdisciplinary instruction, career education, communicative competence, etc. This trend, added to the eclectic movement, further diffused direction and leadership for the profession. Furthermore, not everyone could individualize, do career education, or be interdisciplinary, at least not as they read and heard that they should; and many of us developed professional guilt complexes or became lonesomely disaffected because no one was talking with realism to us. We had so many torches of leadership at the front of the troops that we hardly knew which to follow--and the torches didn't always move in the same direction.

All had good intentions. We have not, however, enjoyed the direction that the foreign language profession needs and deserves. Inadvertently instruction directed to our basic four-skill philosophy has been traded off in favor of

specialized aspects of foreign language teaching. Those aspects or approaches or techniques certainly have an important role to play, but they are not ends themselves. They became ends, however.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PRESENT

This review of the past brings us to the present. Where are we? What do we know about foreign language teaching? This author frequently asks herself those questions. A question provokes a search for an answer. There is much cause for excitement today and optimism for tomorrow. There is equally as much reason to be discouraged.

Let us first examine the positive. I believe that, in general, foreign language instruction today is better than it has ever been before in the history of the United States. It is directed to more comprehensive objectives--all four, plus culture. Because we know better how to teach a wider range of student ability, we can be successful with a more comprehensive population. With movements such as that for individualizing instruction, the availability of a variety of equipment and materials, and the increased number of teachers who are genuinely competent in the language, teachers bring the best expertise and resources into the classroom that we have ever enjoyed. I believe that we do know what good foreign language teaching is; teachers today are more competent and many are more committed than ever before; we have more options and opportunities at our disposal than previous generations did. We are capable of excellence in foreign language teaching.

Excellence indeed characterizes many of our classrooms. The following statement was developed by the Virginia Foreign Language Supervisors' Association to describe the effective instruction that is observed in many teachers' classes.

WHAT A GOOD FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASS LOOKS LIKE

Activities

1. The target language is used almost exclusively by both teacher and students. Students almost never use English, and teachers use it only rarely for concise explanations with quick reversion to the target language for practice.

2. Most of the time is spent on teaching listening and speaking, even though the objectives include reading and writing as well. The written skills and a real command of grammar come from oral usage. Speaking the language occurs almost continuously throughout the class.

3. Much of the target language is free response, non-manipulated, non-drill-like in nature.

4. Students speak up in the target language freely with little or no inhibition.

5. The textbook and other teaching materials, although they may be the basis for much of what takes place, are rarely obvious. The text is open only infrequently, especially in first- and second-year classes.

6. New material introduced--be it grammar, vocabulary, cultural concepts, or a combination of these--is limited in amount at a given time.

7. A variety of activities characterizes the lesson.

8. The teacher adapts the text (or other material) to the local circumstances, using it as a springboard for creating a personalized, localized, and meaningful communications atmosphere.

9. Materials and equipment supplementary to the text are frequently used.

Planning

1. Planning for instruction is obvious in that the class is organized and structured and meaningful activities are chosen.

2. The purpose of each activity are clear to all, especially to the students.

Class Climate

1. Much energy prevails on the part of teacher and students, but it is organized, productive, channeled, and non-disruptive energy.

2. A seriousness of purpose characterizes the teacher, the students, and everything that goes on.

3. A relaxed and informal but mutually respectful relationship between teachers and students is obvious.

4. Rarely do discipline problems occur. Students are kept too constructively occupied to get into trouble except when extremist behavior is manifested in individual cases.

5. Bulletin boards and other means are used to the fullest to create a cultural ambiance appropriate to the language being taught.

Results

1. The students are obviously learning and are aware that they are. They are experiencing a gratifying feeling of achievement.

Summary Note

1. The speaking skill occupies a much larger portion of the time than the others. Students who can speak well can usually do the other skills well also. If the focus is on reading and writing, they usually cannot speak well and their command of all of the other skills is artificial and insecure. In other words, the ability to speak is a reasonably dependable measure of performance in all of the skills. The same cannot be said of the others.

The kind of instruction just described exists in many foreign language classrooms today. It is so dynamic that it causes experienced and jaded observers to undergo anew great excitement each time that it is encountered. On the other hand, it is not always present, much to the chagrin of those who analyse foreign language instruction today. A review of the problems is now in order.

Perhaps our greatest dilemma is that most of us who are not born creative, insightful masters of teaching have never had a good opportunity to learn to be good teachers. Most of us have learned most of what we know as students sitting at the feet of other teachers who may have been pedants rather than masters. We stumble blindly. This author graduated from college in 1956 having had no methodological instruction in foreign languages except what was picked up through six weeks of student teaching by whatever kind of supervising teacher she happened to have and an occasional visit by a foreign language professor who was not trained in foreign language pedagogy. Today in 1979, although the opportunities for competency in the language are better and we know much more about the science of language learning, the average graduate can expect no more, and indeed perhaps receives even less. Shamefully little, if any, progress has been made in teacher education despite the advancement of the science of teaching foreign languages. The opportunities for young teachers today to gain access to the vastly improved knowledge about the science of language teaching are severely limited. (The art of teaching does not have to be learned through instruction, thus some succeed in spite of that limitation.)

Similar problems plague inservice education. Regression has even occurred on this level in the area of pedagogy. During the NDEA days of the 1960's, summer institutes helped many teachers with potential to develop much greater effectiveness in the classroom. Today such opportunities are rare and difficult to find, whatever the sacrifice and cost one is willing to make to seek them out.

In summary, teacher education at both the preservice and inservice levels is at a standstill. Ironically, the inservice demands upon the teacher have increased. The gap widens, sometimes seemingly to an exponential degree.

A recent study by Wilga Rivers reveals information which perhaps is related both to the preparation of teachers and to the leadership for the professional.[1]

---

1. Wilga Rivers, Questionnaire on Foreign Language Learners' Goals, mimeograph, 1979.

She conducted a survey to determine the objectives of instruction in various languages, at different levels, in regions of the United States, and in a number of other countries. Generally speaking college and university programs, especially in French, are directed less toward the oral skills than toward other objectives such as literature and intellectual development. High school teachers therefore tend to be influenced by instructors whose objectives are at variance with their own. They observe methodology which is not particularly applicable to their responsibilities, and they are confused by a profession which is divided as to its objectives.

We turn now to certain specific methodological problems which should be pointed out. One of them is that the textbook is omnipresent and ever open. The term "textbook" is used in a comprehensive context--it might be a learning activity packet or a newspaper--but, whatever the instructional materials, they tend to dominate teachers and students. They have once again become a crutch for both, just as they were in the pre-audiolingual days. Take them away, and performance in any skill becomes nearly impossible in too many instances. Teachers and students become speechless. German becomes the subject between the covers of a book. Humanization? That is difficult when teachers and students aren't even looking at each other. Their eyes are glued to texts. This problem has developed primarily because of the lack of adequate methodological preparation of teachers and the frustration which teachers experience when many goals are set for them and many demands are placed upon them without clarity of direction. It is easier to succumb to page-turning instruction than to be resourceful and creative.

A very detrimental condition afflicting foreign language teaching today is the unrealistic pacing of instruction. Material is presented to students much too rapidly. In the high schools we try to introduce the entire corpus of the language in two textbooks or levels or years of instruction. At the college level, this usually can be translated into one year. A number of negative effects occur and bear review:

Articulation. Teachers cope with the challenge of too much material in various ways. Some, perhaps half of the teachers, make major adaptations, such as using two books over a three-year period. Others go only as far as they can with one book per level, leaving out much of the material and making the best of the dilemma at the beginning of the next school year. Students therefore move from one teacher or one school to another or go on to enter college programs with varying degrees of competence or even coverage at the same level of language instruction. Articulation problems are far worse now than they were two decades ago, primarily as a result of the increased diversity of practices regarding coverage. In other words, quantity now as well as quality of instruction affects learning to a great degree.

Motivation and Dropouts. Students become discouraged when they experience large gaps in the sequencing of instruction or are required to repeat large blocks of material. Many teachers believe that the articulation problems are a major contribution to the high percentage of dropouts characterizing foreign language programs in the United States today.

Morale. Teacher morale is affected by the lack of realism concerning what is supposed to be covered, the pressures teachers feel to finish the book, and the physical and mental demands placed upon them when their work is increased by the need to develop handouts, to attend additional curricular meetings concerned with the issue, etc. Nor do students or parents understand when students continue using the first-year book in the second year. In Catch 22 fashion, if adjustments are not made, the students experience pressure and morale problems of a different nature because most cannot keep up as they know they should.

Learning Effects. When the pace is not slowed, learning becomes superficial. Students are exposed to material without having the time either to understand it fully or to master it. Teachers recognize that they should work more frequently with culture, and they have been encouraged to diversify instructional activities to make learning more effective, yet they often have to sacrifice these desirable or even essential activities, to "get through the book."

Expense. In cases in which two levels are spread over three years, additional books have to be purchased for the overlap period. Textbook acquisition, however financed, nearly doubles when this occurs, and this requires money that could much more productively be invested in other scholastic applications.

The Role of the Teacher. Teachers cannot be as creative as they might be for they are too busy rewriting the curriculum, adapting materials, creating handouts, trying to make adjustments, and just coping. They become slaves to texts, even when they recognize the problem and do not wish to do so.

The Special Dilemma of the Small School District. Textbooks can never be perfect and local adaptions always need to be made. That generalization is valid, but it must also be recognized that large school districts with supervisory assistance or large numbers of teachers have the human and financial resources to make the adaptations needed to cope with the problems of pacing instruction whereas the small ones often do not. The majority of our teachers are in school districts which have fewer than ten foreign language instructors. They often do not have enough professional voice to get administrators to honor their requests for change, or alone they may lack the courage to ask for change. It is therefore not possible for many teachers to make the adjustments that they know need to be made, and the small school districts are most likely to remain victimized by the bad circumstances in which they find themselves.

In conclusion to the textbook issue, we in the profession decided during the post-World War II and Sputnik days of the early 1960's that we had better catch up with the Russians verbally as well as technologically, so we added two skills--listening and speaking--to our traditional objectives of reading and writing. We also realized that we ought to know more about the peoples of

the world, so we expanded, intensified, and changed the teaching of culture. These were overdue changes, even if they were precipitated by the Russians and the wrong reasons. But where we went very wrong is that we expected teachers to cover the previous course, curriculum, or whatever one might wish to call it--that is, from "good morning" through the past subjunctive by June of level two--and teach the student to speak the language as well, plus give him/her new insights into the culture(s) of the language taught. We are only fooling ourselves if we think that we can do all of this. The second year has become what Beverly Enwall, the Secondary School Curriculum Director in the South Carolina Department of Education, calls "the verb year." The profession is in the midst of self-examination, and some reforms have already been accomplished. It is time now to respond to the need that so many teachers recognize: the need to cut the grammar pie at least three ways instead of two, and to design textbooks accordingly. We are trying to do what no other country of this hemisphere or Western Europe attempts to do, and we generally have less motivation to learn foreign languages than they do. How is it that we can achieve our language goals so much faster than they can? The answer is that we cannot.

Fortunately, the profession is in the midst of dealing with this issue. Many teachers--perhaps more than half of them--have already slowed the pace of instruction, despite the limiting design of texts. A movement is underway to seek the revision of textbooks to make foreign language learning more attainable for more students. In the meantime, however, it is a serious curricular issue; it is not a mere technical problem. It affects thousands of students throughout the country.

CONCLUSION, OR WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

In summary we have seen that World War II was the turning point toward more comprehensive four-skill instruction. With this development came more attention to the science of teaching. We also observed that the audiolingual revolution, greatly aided by the NDEA Institute program, was short-lived. Colleges and universities did not seize upon the examples set by the institutes; the federal money ended; and the momentum was lost. In reality, we never gave the audiolingual revolution a fair chance at succeeding. Eclecticism slipped into the vacuum and encouraged teachers to develop a laissez-faire attitude toward their classroom behavior. Concurrently, many schools of thought regarding specialized aspects of teaching were advanced, and leadership for the profession became very diffused.

As a result, we have many teachers today whose every class is an exciting adventure in learning. We have equally as many who are driving our students out of our discipline because they are monotonous, uninspiring pedants. In between is a vast group with varying degrees of expertise, dedication, and potential but for whom little help is available to address any of their problems.

What can be said with assurance is that we are not where we are capable of being in foreign language teaching today. The elements are present for the profession to be much more effective than it is. From within, it needs more focused, thoughtful leadership; and there are signs that good developments are taking place in this respect. There seems to be more unity of attack on basic issues;

and some fundamental problems, such as the pacing of instruction, are being addressed. From without, it needs assistance that the President's Commission can offer. For too long only we have spoken for ourselves. The profession needs the moral support that such a prestigious and influential body as the Commission can offer through encouraging greater public advocacy of foreign language study. It needs the influence of such an out-of-the-ranks group as the Commission to urge those preparing teachers to do so with care and alacrity. Most of all, the profession needs specific help in training, retraining, and developing the full potential of teachers. This author considers the NDEA institute program, in spite of the brevity of its tenure, to have been the most influential positive influence ever exerted on the profession and foreign language instruction. We need a similar program today, redesigned to address the specific issues and problems that are prevalent now. There is no way to improve instruction faster and more effectively than to improve the capabilities of our teachers. They need improvement in many respects, but most especially, they need better pedagogical preparation. A poor teacher cannot be made into a good one, but a good teacher can be helped to be better. We need to address that problem, for we have at our disposal many resources and much knowledge to help the good teacher become better. Many of us within the profession are aware of this, but we need help in making it happen. We cannot do it by ourselves. We call upon the Commission to identify the means appropriate to provide a program of training and retraining that will be accessible to foreign language teachers at all levels throughout the nation. Such a program would do more to teach more Americans foreign languages than any other single measure that it might devise.

THE LAST WORD--ABOUT LATIN

Latin deserves to be reviewed separately from the modern languages, for the changes which it has undergone and the reasons for the changes are different from those of the modern languages. Latin has many secondary objectives such as developing vocabulary, deepening the understanding of grammar, and instilling an appreciation of the cultural legacy which the language contributed to our society. The primary purpose, however, which teachers almost universally offer for the study of Latin, is to develop a reading skill in that language. The reasons for studying a language affect the methodology used to teach it.

For many years, the most prevalent activities used in classics classrooms were those such as silent reading in Latin with belabored translation into English, translation exercises from English into Latin or vice versa, and word derivative studies. The sum total was that students rarely actively used Latin in any form except in the classes of a few teachers who would go as far as to read Latin orally to their students or have them read aloud. In the 1960's, Latin, receiving competition from enrollment increases in the modern languages that had begun to teach students to speak, began to lose students; and enrollments declined rapidly. Some programs had to be terminated, and the demise of others was threatened. Perhaps it was this development that stirred a few classicists into initiating the reform of Latin methodology to make that language more competitive and, more important, to question the effectiveness of traditional methods in the achievement of the goals of Latin instruction. Whatever the influences and motives, three new and very different instructional programs

went onto the market. One Danish, one British, and one American, they all incorporated the oral use of Latin, not to develop oral proficiency in a language no longer spoken, but to relate the four skills in the achievement of the primary goal--reading. It is probably fair to say that the classics wisely took advantage of the modern languages' increased acceptance of the science of linguistics and its applications in the classroom.

The new programs were never widely adopted by teachers; however they were accepted by enough to inject a strong new influence into almost all Latin classrooms today. They made the Latin student a much more orally active and involved participant in the instructional process. Ferment and excitement began to permeate the Latin profession, and many teachers who did not embrace the new methodology in toto began to reform their use of traditional texts. They exchanged greetings in Latin with the students, they increased their own and their students' oral reading of Latin, they gave classroom directions in the language, and some even asked questions and elicited answers in Latin. Significantly, two types of teachers engaged in the reform. The solid, experienced war-horses joined with the new young blood to give the movement needed credibility.

The results of this reform were very positive. Almost invariably those programs which had benefitted from change ceased to lose students; and in some, increased numbers swelled the ranks. Unfortunately, most of those teachers who refused to recognize that Latin classrooms had to become more exciting places for students to go committed methodological suicide, and their programs disappeared.

The end result is that currently the quality of instruction in the Latin classroom is, generally speaking, more uniformly good and dynamic than it was a decade or more ago.

Nevertheless, it is difficult to predict the future of Latin in the curriculum. In some areas of the country where reform did not enter and other factors served to erode the ranks, Latin has practically disappeared. In others, enrollments have stabilized or even increased. Also, the recognition of the need to speak other languages offers strong competition with which classicists have difficulty competing. On the other hand, the public's current emphasis upon the basics is prompting curricular reform which underscores the value of so-called "solid" subjects such as Latin and which reemphasizes the relationship between a knowledge of Latin and better understanding of one's own language.

This author, although not a classicist in her own professional background, believes, with many others, that Latin has great worth in American society. The Commission is urged to help assure Latin a place in the curriculum by recognizing this language in its report with specific recommended programs of action.

METHODOLOGICAL TRENDS IN COLLEGE FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION: A REPORT

David P. Benseler, Department of German, Ohio State University
Renate A. Schulz, Department of Foreign Languages, University of Arkansas

This paper is written in response to a request from the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies to help it in the "assessment of the results of current (or recent past) methodologies for Foreign Language teaching" on the college and university level and in the "search for promising methodologies for the future." Specifically, we were asked to address the following questions:

1) What is the current state of foreign language instruction at the university level?
What methodologies are being used, how intensive are the courses, etc.

2) Are demands of the students (and the institutions) being met? How successful are foreign language programs in teaching the languages to the students?
How much of the foreign language is retained without reinforcement, and for how long?

3) What hopeful new foreign language teaching methodologies are being developed? What do you see as the future of these methodologies? What is the extended outlook?

In the following pages of this paper, we attempt to answer those questions based on available evidence in published reports and personal knowledge and experience. We assume throughout that our comments are for a lay audience and not for fellow foreign language professionals.

For nearly a decade now, the foreign language teaching profession has operated with a crisis orientation. Enrollments have been declining steadily on all levels and in all of the commonly taught languages except Spanish.[1] This situation has led, as was to be expected, to a concomitant loss of teaching positions in the nation's two-and four-year institutions of higher education.[2]

This increasingly sad state of affairs is also reflected in other, equally disturbing developments. The most important of these can be given as follows:

1) The number of students majoring in foreign languages has declined (on both the undergraduate and graduate levels), thus reducing substantially the number of potential specialists trained in foreign-language and international studies who would be immediately available in times of national crisis or emergency (Schulz, NEH Report, p. 19).

2) Colleges and universities have eliminated or reduced drastically foreign language requirements--which were weak from the outset (Schulz, NEH Report, pp. 22-24).

3) Existing foreign language requirements are expressed in terms of semester or academic quarter credit hours rather than in specific competencies and/or levels of proficiency.[3]

4) Even some area studies programs are either totally devoid of a foreign-language component or have reduced it to a token level.

5) Perhaps most disturbing of all the issues raised to this point, even the vast majority of those students who begin foreign language study--for whatever reason--remain only until the requirement is completed (if one exists); seldom do they remain with language study long enough to acquire even a minimal proficiency. Indeed, in non-requirement situations, we feel safe in asserting that well over 50% of those students who begin foreign language study on the college level do not continue into the second year of such study.

The crisis orientation of the profession has resulted in some critical self-examination, including a sensitive look at the methodologies of foreign language teaching. If one looks at foreign language methods textbooks currently on the market (e.g., Allen & Valette, Chastain, Grittner, Rivers, Finnochiaro, Paulston, Papalia), few, if any, authors appear to recommend a specifically defined method of teaching.[4] Rather, the call is for eclecticism: teachers should use whatever selected techniques are best suited to the abilities and interests of their own students and to their own personalities and objectives, rather than slavishly subscribing to any one method. However, four approaches need to be mentioned as having had a major influence on present day foreign language teaching: the audiolingual method, the cognitive method, the direct method, and the grammar translation method.

The Audiolingual Method (also called the Aural-Oral, Functional Skills, New Key, or American Method of language teaching). Audiolingualism had its beginnings in the Army Specialized Training Program during World War II. It was based on structural/contrastive linguistic analysis and behaviorist psychology and was touted as "the scientific" method of language teaching. During the fifties and sixties it became widely accepted in the U.S. at all levels, thanks mainly to institutes, made possible by funding from the National Defense Education Act, which trained and re-trained large numbers of pre- and in-service teachers in this approach. While audiolingual objectives include development of all four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing), emphasis is definitely on developing speaking, with much attention to pronunciation and practice in the use of colloquial everyday language. The language skills were to be developed sequentially, i.e., the oral skills (listening and speaking) were to be introduced and practiced before reading and writing. Also, students were not to say anything they had not heard; and they were not to write anything they had not previously seen in writing.

The audiolingual method, influenced by theories of behaviorist psychology, views language as a set of habits. These habits can be acquired through mimicry and memorization of dialogues, various mechanical pattern drills conducted at "normal" speed to overlearn or make automatic for the student

the structural patterns of the target language, and by immediate error correction to "extinguish" any errors. The dialogue, rather than the narrative reading passage, is the main vehicle for the presentation of language materials because of its everyday high frequency vocabulary, and its colloquial and culturally authentic language. Few explicit grammar explanations are given. Rather, students are to formulate grammatical generalizations through analogy during oral pattern drills.[5]

The Cognitive Method

While the objectives of the cognitive method are similar to those of the audiolingual method, its concept of the nature of language differs. Influenced by cognitive psychology, this method views language not as a set of habits acquired through stimulus-response conditioning, but rather as a creative process utilizing mental processes in a conscious, analytical manner. Since language is infinitely varied, the cognitive method aims at teaching the system of the language through formal grammatical explanations and analysis and through cognitive exercises (including translation), which necessitate understanding of the meaning.[6]

The Direct (or Natural) Method

Any method which attempts to use the target language exclusively for instruction and interaction in the classroom can be considered a direct method. Other components usually considered part of direct methodologies are inductive learning of grammatical patterns (i.e., no formal explanations of grammar rules; rather students generalize the rule from a series of examples which illustrate a structural point), avoidance of mechanical pattern drills and translation, and heavy use of question-answer exercises. The use of a direct method pre-supposes native or near-native command of the target language by the teacher. Often, direct methods make heavy use of audio-visual materials, using filmstrips, slides, films, or series of drawings or pictures accompanied by tapes or records. These materials are used to present language in context, to model the utterances, clarify meaning through the visuals, and serve as basis for the question-answer exercises.

The Grammar/Translation Method

As the name indicates, this method focuses on formal and extensive grammatical analysis of the target language and on translation. The development of reading and writing skills are the main objectives of the method. Rooted in the teaching of the classical languages, and based on faculty psychology (which views the mind as a muscle to be developed by means of rigorous exercise), the grammar/translation method considers foreign language learning as intellectual discipline and the approaches used are seen as means to "develop the mind."

The grammar/translation method was the predominant approach before the rise of audiolingualism. It is still utilized in college reading courses where the major goal is on developing reading comprehension for literary, philosophical, or scientific/technical materials.

Several other methodologies are being practiced or experimented with on a relatively small scale and various descriptions of programs, or studies

attempting to measure their effect on the development of foreign language skills, have appeared in the professional literature. Among them are the Confluent Approach, the Psycho-Generative Method, the Silent Method, Suggestology, and the Total Physical Response Method. In the following paragraphs we give a short, simplified description of these relatively recent additions to foreign language teaching methods. Most research studies utilizing these approaches have been conducted with specialized groups of students (highly motivated adult language learners) or under special instructional constraints (e.g., intensive exposure) and findings cannot be generalized to traditional college instruction designed for heterogeneous groups of students.

The Confluent Approach

Confluent education has borrowed from the values clarification and sensitivity training movements in psychotherapy and stresses the affective (emotional) development of the students. The approach utilizes special group interaction techniques (e.g., Gestalt art works, guided fantasies, imagination games, non-verbal interaction strategies, improvisational theatre, values clarification exercises) to enhance the development of interpersonal communication skills, emphasizing the natural relationship between feelings and knowledge.[7] With specific reference to foreign languages Galyean notes: "Students in confluent language classes explore and discuss various aspects of themselves, as well as less personal information, in the target language. By focusing on naturally motivating 'meaning nodes' (needs, concerns, interests, personality traits, values, attitudes, behaviors, dreams, personal imagery, and plans for the future), students are able to learn about themselves while learning a new language. The target language serves as the vehicle for self-awareness, self-expression, and self-affirmation.[8]

The Psycho-Generative Method

This method, developed at the University of Northern Iowa, utilizes five "frames of reference" to teach grammatical structures inductively: 1) the physical world (dealing with tangible things and places); 2) the frame of persons; 3) the frame of activities and actions; 4) the frame of events (time concepts); and 5) the frame of perspective (dealing with personal judgments, opinions, and interpretations). The approach is predominantly oral; it stresses high frequency vocabulary and grammatical structures through situational questioning (the who, what, when, where, how, why of an event).[9]

Teaching Foreign Languages the "Silent Way"

The "Silent Way" is a method pioneered by the British mathematician and psychologist Caleb Gattegno. With the help of a set of wooden rods of different color and length, called Cuisenaire rods, and a set of color-coded phonetic and word charts, the teacher attempts to lead students to language production and to inductive insights about the linguistic patterns of the target language. The target language is used exclusively by teacher and students. The major techniques of method are summarized as follows:

1) Repeated modeling of utterances by the teacher for mimicry by the learner is not necessary, since to speak a language is in most cases to use words differently from the way one hears them used.

2) Rote memorization of basic material is replaced by recognition and familiarity with respect to new structures.

3) Correction is only seldom part of the teacher's work, since the learner has developed his own inner criteria of correctness, and is capable of correcting his own errors.

4) Conditioning and habit-formation drills are replaced by exercises which enable the learner to generate original utterances based on minimum functional vocabulary given by the teacher.

5) Oral work introduced in the beginning is quite early followed by writing.

6) Wherever possible the learner is thrown back upon himself and he takes ever greater responsibility for his own learning.

7) Gradually the teacher says less and less, while the learner says more and more, and the reason for the name "silent way" becomes apparent.[10]

Suggestology

Suggestology in foreign language instruction goes under the name of The Lozanov Method, Suggestopedia, or Suggestive-Accelerative Learning and Teaching (SALT). The method originated in Bulgaria under the direction of physician and psychotherapist Georgi Lozanov. It utilizes techniques of yoga relaxation and concentration to tap subconscious processes in increasing retention of large amounts of vocabulary.

A "suggestive, positive atmosphere," including soft lighting, cheerful room decorations, synchronized music and breathing, dramatic-suggestive use of gestures and intonation by the teacher--all are aimed at putting the students in a mentally relaxed state which is to make him more receptive to language learning.

An instructional "suggestopedic cycle" consists of three distinct parts:

1) Review of previously learned materials, exclusively in the target language, utilizing games, skits and conversation, and avoiding mechanistic or manipulative language practice.

2) Presentation of new materials in the context of practical, and interesting dialogues, with grammatical explanations and translations into the mother tongue.

3) The "seance," considered the only truly original feature of the method, is intended to aid memorization of new materials at an

unconscious level. During this stage, students engage in various relaxation exercises while the teacher re-reads the new materials (including the translations) with varying intonation and at varying levels of loudness--all accompanied in the background by baroque music, which is believed to be especially conducive to "unconscious absorption" of vocabulary.[11]

The Total Physical Response Method

This approach to foreign language teaching is based on the belief that listening comprehension should be developed before stressing active oral performance by students and that "the assimilation of information and skills can be significantly accelerated through the use of the kinesthetic sensory system."[12]

Developed by Psychologist James J. Asher, the method utilizes oral commands which are carried out by the students, showing that the directions were understood. Asher summarizes three "key ideas" of the method:

--Understanding the spoken language should be developed in advance of speaking.

--Understanding should be developed through movements of the student's body. The imperative is a powerful aid because the instuctor can utter commands to manipulate student behavior. Our research suggests that most of the grammatical structure of the target language and hundreds of vocabulary items can be learned through the skillful use of imperative by the instructor.

--Do not attempt to force speaking from students. As the students internalize a cognitive map of the target language through understanding what is heard, there will be a point of readiness to speak. The individual will spontaneously begin to produce utterances (Asher, p.4).[13]

In the context of the above list, one could also mention individualized instruction or self-paced learning (including programmed and computer-assisted instruction), even though many proponents insist that individualization is a philosophy of teaching and learning and not a teaching method as such.[14]

One approach which appears to be gaining in popularity and which has demonstrated some impressive results in terms of developing language proficiency of selected groups of students in a short period of time is intensive instruction or immersion approaches. Intensive instruction is not a methodology as such. The distinctive characteristic of such instruction lies in increasing and concentrating the time of exposure, rather than in any special teaching technique or pedagogical approach. Originally developed during World War II under the auspices of the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP) to give military personnel fluency in a second language within a short amount of time, intensive instruction is now offered by many colleges, either in regular academic year or special summer programs. Intensive instruction has no clear definition, but it generally provides for

1) a large number of instructional contact hours within a relatively short period of time; 2) small group instruction and drill practice; 3) instruction carried out by a teaching team, of which each member has distinct functions; 4) emphasis on spoken colloquial language; 5) little or no use of English during instruction. Immersion programs provide for target language use in and outside the classroom and attempt to involve the students in a real or simulated "foreign experience."[15]

Each method or approach described above has its own special components (and proponents, we might add) and each also presents a rationale, based on assumption, psycholinguistic theories and/or research, as to why these individual components are (or should be) conducive to foreign language learning. We have no clear empirical evidence, however, that one methodology is superior to another in terms of student achievement--with the possible exception of intensive instruction. The professional literature reveals many efforts to establish a superior teaching method. In general, though, most research results are not necessarily generalizable to the "average" college foreign language classroom. One must agree with Hosenfeld's assessment that a "review of current research in foreign language education reveals a plethora of studies marred by inadequate problem development, lack of control of extraneous variables, invalid criterion measures, and inappropriate statistical techniques."[16]

Judging by available instructional materials, most college foreign language programs apparently utilize a modified audiolingual approach with emphasis on the development of all four language skills. The vast majority of published commentary on teaching techniques addresses itself to those which can be easily adapted in the audio-lingual classroom.

A major criticism leveled against audiolingualism is that techniques (i.e., dialog mimicry, memorization and pattern practice) prepare students only for mechanical manipulation of linguistic elements and not for spontaneous communication and interaction. The predominantly mechanical exercises which were the mainstay of audiolingualism are slowly giving way to language-activities which practice the language in real communicative contexts.[17] There is some evidence that the "humanizing" movement has had some positive effects on student attitudes toward language study.[18]

A third apparent trend lies in a growing emphasis on diagnosing individual differences in learning styles and adapting instruction accordingly.[19]

The second group of questions posed by the Commission poses a predicament similar to the first, because (again) we lack dependable empirical evidence regarding: 1) what students really seek to gain from foreign language courses; 2) the teaching and learning objectives for foreign language courses in colleges and universities. Most American institutions of higher education do not list specific objectives for courses; requirements are expressed in terms of credit hours rather than specific competencies, and goals and objectives are specified in terms of a number of units in a textbook. Also, in the American tradition such institutions, public and private alike, enjoy a high degree of autonomy, so the objectives established at one may not necessarily be valid in the next. We can, therefore, approach this question from our present position only by listing often heard reasons for student enrollment in foreign language courses.

At the top of any list of such reasons would have to be the most obvious: to satisfy whatever foreign language requirement that might exist in any institution. That particular group of students doubtless accounts for the vast majority of foreign language enrollments. A survey conducted in Iowa, for example, revealed that 87% of the students taking a foreign language did so primarily to satisfy a requirement.[20]

We suspect strongly that the following reasons could also play a major role with regard to enrollments, and especially with regard to which language a student takes in order to satisfy a requirement. A substantial number of students would doubtless wish to achieve a basic level of oral proficiency in their chosen language.[21] Approximately 60% of Thogmartin's students checked speaking fluency as a personal objective, while only 13% were interested primarily in developing their reading knowledge in order to use the foreign language as a research tool. (However, based on personal experience and informal observation, we can state that many students readjust their initial goals after they discover that speaking proficiency is the most difficult skill to acquire.) In that same survey, 34% of the students hoped to broaden their cultural background and 16% wanted to gain insight into their mother tongue through the study of another language. In summary, we feel it safe to assert that most students perceive a definite utilitarian function for language study.

Very little recent research has been done into the question of how long students retain whatever amounts of a foreign language they might have learned. However, one study published in 1973 concluded that retention is greater than one might reasonably expect: "Although the present findings may be difficult to rationalize completely with respect to current theories of memory, their importance lies in the fact that, on a variety of measures, it has been demonstrated that only relatively small changes in second language performance were recorded over reasonably long periods during which students were not receiving instruction."[22]

In the above pages of this report, we have shown that we have no significant evidence which would enable us to recommend any one methodological approach to foreign language teaching over another. In the strictest sense, therefore, any or all might be termed "hopeful" and have potential for development. All signs seem to suggest that successful language teaching still rests primarily with the preparation, commitment, and enthusiasm of individual teachers. However, within the constraints of this report, we do feel reasonably comfortable in recommending that the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies advocate the following points which we offer as suggestions.

1. We recommend that special consideration be given to the examination of the potential of Intensive Foreign Language Instruction and Immersion Programs. Given the penchant Americans seem to have for rapid results ("instant success," if one will), we feel that these approaches have much to offer which could help bring foreign language study back into the mainstream of American education.

2. Specific competencies for various levels of language study should be determined and implemented under the auspices of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages and of the Modern Language

Association on as broad a scale as possible. This recommendation means, of course, that a curriculum for proficiency-based foreign language learning will have to be developed for both requirement students and for prospective majors in foreign languages.

3. As indicated by the tremendous increase in foreign language-related research publications in recent years, teachers are constantly exploring new methods and curricular prospects.[23] However, we suspect that lack of coordination will result in much duplication of effort and recommend therefore that the means be made available, again, possibly through the auspices of the MLA and/or ACTFL, to enable continued research into the effectiveness of various methodologies in meaningful, coordinated fashion. At present, neither the National Endowment for the Humanities nor the United States Office of Education will sponsor such pedagogically-oriented research. Indeed, the USOE specifically excludes--or gives lowest priority to--projects involving "French, German, and Iberian Spanish." Any such research efforts should assure that findings are statistically dependable and can be generalized and applied in American foreign language classrooms.

4. Finally, we recommend a wide range of summer institutes for college-level teachers be devised and implemented on a continuing basis. Of special interest here is the fact that the NEH Summer Seminar Program, while highly valuable in its own right, again excludes topics not dedicated to historical, literary, and cultural (in the limited sense) topics. The institutes we recommend, while not advocating any particular methodology, should include, but not be limited to:

   --developing an understanding of current psycholinguistic theories and research, knowledge of which would enhance the flexibility of college teachers in their own classrooms;

   --offering special courses and topics in methodology for both graduate teaching assistants and for individuals currently teaching full time on the college level. We deplore the fact that few, if any, Ph.D. programs (aside from those in colleges of Education) require formal pedagogical training as part of the curriculum leading to the doctorate;

   --enabling American-trained foreign language teachers to maintain a high degree of proficiency in the language(s) they teach (especially given the relatively weak position of the dollar on foreign exchanges, which, in turn, limits the possibility for these teachers to travel and study abroad);

   --facilitating the development of teaching materials which take important research results into account.[24]

Notes

1. "Fall 1977 Survey of Foreign Language Enrollments," ADFL Bulletin, 9, iv (1978), p. 49.

2. Renate A. Schulz, "Survey of Successful Undergraduate Foreign Language Programs in U.S. Institutions of Higher Education," Final Narrative Report prepared for the National Endowment for the Humanities, EH-27125-77-67 (March 1978), pp. 10-21.

3. A revealing presentation concerning the plight of students who accumulate enough hours for a major in college, and then seek employment in the federal government, is given by Allen I. Weinstein, "Foreign Language Majors: The Washington Perspective," ADFL Bulletin, 6, iv (1975), pp. 18-27; see also recommendation number ten, "Report of the Task Force on Institutional Language Policy," ADFL Bulletin, 10, ii (1978), p. 4.

4. See, for example, any of the following methods textbooks: Edward D. Allen & Rebecca M. Valette, Classroom Techniques: Foreign Languages and English as a Second Language (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1977); Kenneth Chastain, Developing Second-Language Skills: Theory to Practice (Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1976); Frank M. Grittner, Teaching Foreign Languages (New York: Harper & Row, 1977); Wilga M. Rivers et al, A Practical Guide to the Teaching of French (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), and similar volumes for the teaching of German and Spanish; Anthony Papalia, Learner-Centered Language Teaching: Methods and Materials (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1976).

5. See Chastain, especially pp. 124-27, and Nelson Brooks, "The Meaning of Audiolingual," Modern Language Journal, 59 (1975), pp. 234-40.

6. See Chastain, especially pp. 146-47.

7. See George I. Brown, Mark Phillips & Stewart Shapiro, Getting It All Together: Confluent Education, PDK Fastback Series, 85 (Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Edu, Foundation, 1976).

8. Beverly Galyean, "A Confluent Approach to Curriculum Design," Foreign Language Annals, 12 (1979), p. 121.

9. "The Psycho-Generative Method," undated mimeo, Univ. of Northern Iowa.

10. James Karambelas, "Teaching Foreign Languages 'The Silent Way'," ADFL Bulletin, 3, i (1971), p. 41.

11. See Kay U. Herr, "Suggestive-Accelerative Learning and Teaching in Foreign Languages," Teaching the Basics in the Foreign Language Classroom: Options and Strategies, ed. David P. Benseler, Renate A. Schulz & W. Flint Smith (Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co., 1979); W. Jane Bancroft, "The Lozanov Method and its American Adaptations," Modern Language Journal, 62 (1978), pp. 167-76; Gabriel

L. Racle, "Can Suggestopaedia Revolutionize Language Teaching?" Foreign Language Annals, 12 (1979), pp. 39-49.

12. James J. Asher, Learning Another Language Through Actions: The Complete Teacher's Guidebook (Los Gatos, Cal.: Sky Oaks Productions, 1977), Foreword.

13. See also James J. Asher, JoAnne Kusudo & Rita de la Torre, "Learning a Second Language through Commands: The Second Field Test," Modern Language Journal, 58 (1974), pp. 24-32.

14. The literature on Individualized Instruction is voluminous. See, for example, the following: Howard B. Altman, ed., Individualizing the Foreign Language Classroom: Perspectives for Teachers (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1972); Frank M. Grittner & Fred H. La Leike, Individualized Foreign Language Instruction (Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co., 1973); Gerald E. Logan, (Rowley, Mass: Newbury House, 1973); Renee S. Disick, Individualizing Language Instruction: Strategies and Methods (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1975).

15. David P. Benseler & Renate A. Schulz, Intensive Foreign Language Courses: A Report on Theory and Practice, Language in Education: Theory and Practice (Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1979).

16. Carol Hosenfeld, "A Learning-Teaching View of Second Language Instruction," Foreign Language Annals, 12 (1979) p. 51.

17. See Renate A. Schulz & Walter H. Bartz, "Free to Communicate," Perspective: A New Freedom, ed. Gilbert A. Jarvis, The ACTFL Review of Foreign Language Education, 7 (Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co., 1975), pp. 47-92.

18. See Clay B. Christensen, "Achieving Language Competence with Affective Learning Activities," Foreign Language Annals, 10 (1977), pp. 157-67; Virginia Wilson and Beverly Wattenmaker, Real Communication in Foreign Language (New York: National Humanistic Education Center, 1973)--also available on a language-specific basis from the ACTFL Materials Center/2 Park Avenue/ New York City 10016.

19. Carol Hosenfeld, "Learning about Learning: Discovering our Students' Strategies," Foreign Language Annals, 9 (1976), pp. 117-29; see also Derek N. Nunney, "Educational Cognitive Style: A Basis for Personalizing Foreign Language Instruction"; Helen S. Lepke, "Discovering Student Learning Styles through Cognitive Style Mapping"; Harry Reinert, "ELSIE is no Bull! or: On Utilizing Information Concerning Student Learning Styles," all in Personalizing Foreign Language Instruction: Learning Styles and Teaching Options, ed. Renate A. Schulz (Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co., (1977), pp. 1-14, 15-20, and 21-28 respectively.

20. Clyde Thogmartin, "A Survey of Attitudes toward Foreign Language Education among 247 First-Year Language Students at Iowa State University," ADFL Bulletin, 3, ii (1971), pp. 39-45; see also John L. Walker, "The Student View: Attitudes toward Foreign Language Learning," An Integrative Approach to Foreign Language Teaching: Choosing among the Options, ed. Gilbert A. Jarvis, ACTFL Review of Foreign Language Education, 8 (Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co., 1976), pp. 129-50.

21. See Thogmartin, p. 44, response to question 9a.

22. P.C. Smythe, G.C. Jutras, J.R. Bramwell & Robert C. Gardner, "Second Language Retention over varying Intervals," Modern Language Journal, 57 (1973), p. 405.

23. See Leon A. Jakobovits, Foreign Language Learning: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of the Issues (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1970) and Earl W. Stevick, Memory, Meaning and Method: Some Psychological Perspectives on Language Learning (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1976).

24. In addition to the recommendations given in the body of this paper, the authors wish to draw attention to those of the MLA/ACLS Task Forces. The reports of these Task Forces have been published: (a) "Report of the Task Force on the Commonly Taught Languages," ADFL Bulletin, 10, i (1978), pp. 1-7; (b) "Report of the Task Force on the Less Commonly Taught Languages," ADFL Bulletin, 10, i (1978), pp. 7-11; (c) "Report of the Task Force on Institutional Language Policy," ADFL Bulletin, 10, ii (1978), pp. 1-11; (d) "Report of the Task Force on Public Awareness," ADFL Bulletin, 10, iii (1979), pp. 1-3; (e) "Report of the Task Force on Government Relations," ADFL Bulletin, 10, iv (1979), pp. 1-4.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TESTING
BACKGROUND

Protase E. Woodford, Associate Director
International Office, Educational Testing Service

"When any scholar is able to read Tully or such like classical Latin author ex tempore and make and speake true Latin in verse and prose, suo Marte, and decline perfectly the paradigms of nouns and verbes in ye Greeke tongue, then may hee bee admitted into ye college, nor shall any claim admission before such qualifications." (Harvard College, 1642)

One cannot consider foreign language testing apart from the teaching learning process. Indeed, a major impediment to effective measurement and, curiously, to effective teaching has been this artificial separation of the evaluation piece from the language learning/teaching whole.

Someone had to determine whether the scholar had or had not "such qualifications." Foreign language testing, then, has been with us since before the founding of the Republic.

Classical languages, Latin and Greek, were a part of the standard curriculum from the beginning. Modern languages, German and French, became respectable and entered the curriculum in the ninteenth century.

The goals of classical language instruction were the development of reading ability and the ability to "decline perfectly the paradigms of nouns and verbs." It was thought that the mental discipline required to memorize and apply grammatical rules was in itself a highly desirable goal. These goals carried over to the teaching of modern languages.

Development of oral skills had a very low priority in most foreign language programs until World War II.

Foreign language tests of the prewar era and, with rare exceptions, up through the 1950's assessed the students' knowledge of grammatical rules; ability to translate sentences and paragraphs; ability to recognize the English equivalents of foreign words and, to a lesser extent, ability to read simple prose in the foreign language.

The need for personnel able to communicate in foreign languages prompted the military to develop their own language training programs. These programs, notably the Army Language School in Monterey, California, concentrated on developing oral communication skills. Prisoner interrogators and radio interceptors had no need to read Goethe or translate Hai Ku.

The apparent success of the military language training programs led in part to the major foreign language teaching innovations of the 1960s. The 1960s witnessed the great shift from concentration on literacy skills in foreign languages to emphasis on oral skills. Foreign language tests continued to focus on grammar, vocabulary and reading until the early 1960s when testing finally caught up with teaching.

With support from the Office of Education (under NDEA) the Modern Language Association developed batteries of tests in five modern languages. For each language there was a test in each of the four language skills -- listening, speaking, reading, writing in alternate versions at two levels. The lower level was suitable for secondary school students at the end of the first or second year of language instruction or college students at the end of one or two semesters. There was another series for students with three or more high school years or college semesters of study.

The MLA, at the same time, developed batteries of tests for teachers and advanced students. These two included tests of all four skills in addition to tests in applied linguistics and civilization and culture, in five languages. Paul Pimsleur, working with a major publisher, developed a series of language skills tests for secondary schools not dissimilar to the MLA secondary school batteries. At about the same time, the national foreign language teachers' associations -- The American Association of Teachers of German (AATG) and the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (AATSP) revised their examinations to include measures of listening comprehension.

By 1969-70, the College Board foreign language tests, too, had begun to reflect the emphasis on oral skills by including listening comprehension tests first in their supplementary testing program and later as part of the regular Admissions Testing Program. During the first years of this decade tests of listening comprehension were included in the majority of modern language examinations including those prepared and distributed by textbooks publishers to accompany their teaching materials.

While these language testing activities were going on in the traditional academic context, other language teaching and testing efforts were being carried out outside the school and college classroom. The military, the Peace Corps, the Foreign Service and the intelligence community designed new or improved existing instructional programs geared to the development of oral communication skills.

Linguists at the Foreign Service Institute developed a series of descriptions of levels of speaking ability in foreign languages. The now well-known FSI scale provided operational descriptions of speaking ability from 0 -- no competence to 5 -- ability equal to that of an educated native speaker. The means whereby FSI would assign the ratings was a face-to-face interview of up to thirty minutes duration. The interview and the scale were subsequently adopted by other federal government agencies. The FSI scale for speaking ability was the basis for the scoring scheme used by the MLA for its speaking tests.

The last forms of the MLA tests were copyrighted in 1963, the latest of the Pimsleur in 1967. Since 1967 no nationally-used standardized foreign language classroom tests have been created. Foreign language teachers have had to rely on seriously dated or compromised published tests or on those of their own confection.

The decline in foreign language enrollments was accompanied in large part by a decline in interest and effort in foreign language testing. There were a few steps forward and a few steps back. The College Board, during the present decade, introduced into its Advanced Placement French and Spanish programs,

advanced tests of language skills including speaking and writing. During the same period, however, the Board was forced by budgetary constraints to discontinue the listening comprehension section in its modern language tests in the larger Admissions Testing Program.

Outside the schools and colleges there was increased interest in direct measures of speaking ability. The FSI/Peace Corps model was being adopted and adapted for other applications. The bilingual education movement in the U.S. and Canada made necessary assessment of face-to-face communicative competence. State and provincial departments of education, and city school districts required evidence of student and teacher language competence in both the national language(s) and the home language. The interview and scale were used for these purposes.

That is where we have been and about where we are now. Where should we be in foreign language testing and how can we get there?

NEEDS

Formative and Summative Evaluation

Language teaching programs in schools and colleges traditionally have been designed to follow carefully controlled sequences of grammar and vocabulary introduction. Tests suitable to measuring the mastery of each small step in a sequence must be closely linked to the program and the materials. Good performance on such tests will indicate success in mastering the course material. It will not, necessarily, indicate mastery of a foreign language skill.

Needs fall into three major areas: (1) the adoption and acceptance of a common yardstick, a series of descriptors of foreign language ability that are based on real life performance; (2) training programs and materials to prepare teachers to evaluate pupil progress within their own foreign language programs; (3) development of receptive skills tests, listening and reading, that can be administered nationally requiring no special skill in test administration nor extraordinary expense.

1. The Common Yardstick. Within the academic foreign language teaching community, there are a variety of standards whose meaning unfortunately in operational terms is at best fuzzy and at worst nonexistent. One teacher's A is another teacher's C. What can a person with a score of 600 on a 200-800 scale read, say, write, understand? What does someone in the 80th percentile on a standardized test write with clarity? What does she read with understanding, etc.?

The Foreign Service Institute and the military and others in the federal government have adopted a common scale for describing speaking ability. This scale or one similar should be propagated, explained and its adoption encouraged throughout the foreign language teaching community. One of the possible causes of the disillusionment of American students with foreign languages may have been the meaninglessness of grades and marks in foreign languages. Recipients of A's in a beginning language course who then found themselves incommunicado in the country whose language they have purportedly learned, will not likely be foreign language advocates. The meaning of the A must be clear.

You have mastered the stuff of this particular language teaching program. That student's real life ability to communicate, however, must be described by a label as external to the specific program of study.

In addition to the FSI scale for describing oral proficiency, scales or series of descriptions of ability for the other three language skills need to be developed and adopted.

2. Training Programs and Materials. Language training programs in the schools and colleges follow a carefully designed sequence in order for the teacher to understand when to move on in the sequence, to introduce new structures, new vocabulary, etc. The teacher must know to what degree students have mastered previously presented materials. This kind of continuing formative evaluation requires some degree of skill on the part of the teacher. Test exercises must be constructed in such a way that they zero in on the specific point at issue so that a right or wrong answer will tell the teacher whether or not the student has learned the point at issue. Tests and measurement courses at universities usually deal primarily with statistical issues and rarely with practical test development problems. Specific courses in foreign language testing are extremely rare. Many foreign language teachers become defensive about their own home-made tests because they themselves know that they are often flawed instruments. This is in no way the fault of the teacher but rather of the training programs that have neglected this important area.

Indeed, the vast majority of decisions regarding placement, promotion and final grades in foreign languages are based upon the results of these teacher-made tests. Many foreign language teachers are completely ignorant of the four skills and how to analyze the results of the test.

3. National Examinations. The last widely used standardized classroom tests in foreign languages were developed over a decade ago. Although some of these tests are still available, they may have been so used that they are no longer in any way secure, and the normative data are outdated. These tests, too, tended to reflect the particular methodologies and program goals of the late 50's and early 60's when they underwent initial development. Standardized tests of productive skills, speaking and writing, are expensive to develop, administer, and score. Although their validity may be high, their reliability, unless stringent measures are taken to ensure it, is often questionable, particularly in a classroom context.

It is also axiomatic that skills that are not tested are often not learned. When students realize that certain skill areas are not evaluated, they tend to give less importance to those areas. However, in the case of national examinations some compromise can be worked out.

We know that performance in receptive skills often correlates highly with performance in productive skills, that is, those who understand a language well usually speak it better than those who do not understand it well. Those who read a language well are far more likely to write it well than those who cannot read well. Indeed, productive skills mastery can hardly exist without previous mastery of the matched receptive skills. One cannot write a foreign language without being able to read it. One cannot speak it without understanding it.

This being the case, national examinations in reading and listening comprehension could well serve a twofold purpose: (1) providing an indication of the level of proficiency of American students in those two skills; and (2) providing an indirect measure of the productive skills, particularly speaking, of the test population. Initial development of such tests might be limited to the most commonly taught languages, Spanish, French, and German. Later development in the less commonly taught languages could follow the model of the initial three. Because these national reading and listening tests would not be based on any specific curriculum nor set of pedagogical materials, the content would be drawn from real-life sources; in reading, for example, signs, newspapers, directions, advertisements, right up to technical manuals and narrative prose.

ACTION PLAN

I. The Common Yardstick. Development of descriptive materials for the language proficiency scale. Because the FSI/Peace Corps language proficiency scale is already in wide use in government circles and elsewhere, it is recommended that this scale be endorsed by the Commission and its dissemination be effected in the following way:

A. Packets with printed descriptions of the levels and recorded samples of performances at various score levels be prepared. These sample materials should be developed in the commonly taught languages and in English using samples of non-English speech. The English samples will serve a dual purpose. They will in themselves represent the scale as it applies to English as a foreign language and can also be used to describe the performance levels represented by the scale for those language teachers and others whose interest is in languages not represented in the descriptive packets. For example, teachers of Swedish would likely not have sample materials in Swedish to refer to but could use the English samples to gain an understanding of the performance levels.

An alternative approach to the adoption in toto of the FSI/Peace Corps scale would be to go through a relatively lengthy process of meetings, conferences and colloquia for the purpose of developing and/or identifying and adopting a common scale for oral proficiency. This, quite frankly, appears somewhat wasteful since a widely-accepted scale already exists. The development of the packets with printed description and tape recorded (cassette) samples in 3 or 4 languages need not be excessively costly. They should be available for wide distribution to foreign language departments in colleges and schools. Their availability should be announced in various foreign language journals and at the meetings, regional and national, of the relevant foreign language groups: ACTFL, MLA, Northeast Conference, AATSP, AATF, AATG, AATSEEL, TESOL, NABE, etc. Together with the informative materials contained in the packets, a series of training sessions for school and college foreign language staff should be supported. FSI and ETS in their programs to train interview testers for the language proficiency tests require upwards of three days to a week to train and certify. This training period could well be abbreviated since the level of reliability needed for classroom application need not be as high as for foreign service and Peace Corps uses. A one-and-a-half or two-day session with one trainer and up to a dozen faculty members using video tapes as support would provide school people with a complete understanding of the meaning of the scale and levels and with at least rudimentary skills in administering and rating a language interview test.

II. Classroom testing. The improvement of classroom teachers' foreign language testing skills should be focused in two areas: in teacher training institutions and in-service training programs. There will be some overlap particularly with regard to materials. Within the teacher training programs either in the methods courses or in short courses on foreign language testing activities dealing with test development in the four skills, test interpretation and diagnostic use of test instruments must be emphasized. One reason why this is not done currently to any great extent is that many methods teachers are themselves inadequately prepared in the area of foreign language measurement. Therefore, it is proposed that:

(A) A task force of foreign language testing specialists be charged with the development of appropriate training materials in foreign language testing to be used for teacher training both within the college and university methods and testing courses and perhaps more importantly in in-service programs in the schools. These materials should include both printed materials and appropriate visual and audio support materials.

(B) A summer institute (on the NDEA model) be established for foreign language methods instructors to acquaint them with the materials developed by the task force and to provide intensive training in the teaching of foreign language testing. The instructors at the institute should be members of the task force that developed the materials.

(C) Production and distribution of foreign language evaluation training materials be undertaken. These training materials should be available to colleges and universities for their methods courses and to school systems for in-service training of their foreign language teachers. The first group of summer institute participants could serve as a cadre of trainers who could be called upon to work with in-service programs using the materials with which they would already be familiar.

IV. Development of nationally administered listening comprehension and reading tests in the most commonly taught languages. It is recommended that alternate forms of listening and reading tests be developed and designed for a population of upper secondary school through university foreign language learners. The content of these examinations should be determined on the basis of preliminary research into the frequency of the vocabulary and structures in both oral and printed language. Although these examinations would be norm-referenced, they would also be linked to performance tests in the productive skills so that for large numbers of examinees, predictions of productive skill proficiency could be made on the basis of the receptive skills tests. These tests would be objective, multiple-choice tests long enough to provide assessment of skills from about 0 - FSI/Peace Corps level to about level 3.

The tests would be administerable by non-specialists and would require no special equipment for administration other than a tape recorder. The target population would be secondary school students, undergraduate students, both foreign language majors and non-majors, and a representative sample of "non-traditional learners," i.e., proprietary language school students, Peace Corps volunteers, etc.

Norming for this examination would require fairly large samples from the target groups, secondary school, college and non-traditional students. Smaller samples of examinees would be administered direct measures of speaking ability and writing ability. For example, if a sample of 1,000 students each from high school, college and non-traditional programs were to take the listening and reading tests, a smaller group from each of the three would be selected, perhaps 100. Of the 100 chosen, equal numbers of high average and low scorers would be included. These examinees then would be given the direct measures of speaking and writing and their performance on these direct measures would be compared to their scores on the listening and reading tests. If, as is likely, the correlation between passive skill and active skill performance is high, then reasonable assumptions concerning speaking and writing ability for large numbers of students could be made on the basis of inexpensive, easily-administered receptive skills tests.

Upon completion of the norming administrations and the direct measures (speaking and writing tests) samples of the exercises successfully performed by examinees at different score levels would be compiled. These compilations would serve as interpretive material for score recipients. For example, a score recipient receiving a score of X for a candidate would also receive a brochure with samples of reading materials that the X level candidate reads with comprehension and short writing samples of X level candidates. Such interpretive materials would provide the score recipient with far more useful information than a mere number on a score report.

It may be that the listening and reading tests would serve well as indicators of progress or lack of progress among the general language learning population on a longitudinal basis. Equated parallel forms of these tests could be administered periodically to similar samples of learners and comparative data derived. Indeed, some individuals might be tracked for some years using these instruments since they could readily be self-administered at home by the interested language learner and his or her language improvement or deterioration could be observed over the years.

The measurement needs herein described apply to that vast number of language learners for whom the foreign language is to be a useful tool either for touristic purposes or in conjunction with the skills for job related purposes. The absence of emphasis on the role of literature and related measurement issues is not to be construed as a lack of recognition of the critically important place of literary studies in the preparation of foreign language teachers and specialists and continued support for such studies. Rather, it can be interpreted as recognition of the fact that effective measurement in the domain of literature currently exists. Therefore, priority is given to the development of criteria and measures for basic language skills.

FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN THE USA: A NATIONAL SURVEY OF AMERICAN ATTITUDES AND EXPERIENCE

Peter A. Eddy
Center for Applied Linguistics

In April 1979 the University of Michigan Survey Research Center conducted a telephone survey to discover the attitudes and experience of Americans with regard to the study of foreign languages.[1] The survey of a nationally representative sample of 962 respondents was ordered by the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, with funding from the U.S. Office of Education, the Ford Motor Company, the Hewlett Foundation, the Joint National Committee for Languages, and the Modern Language Assocation of America. The survey gathered information in the following five areas: language spoken in the home during childhood, Americans' experience learning foreign languages, current use of foreign languages by Americans, attitudes toward the worth of foreign language knowledge, and opinions about foreign language requirements at various levels of education, from elementary through undergraduate.

For the vast majority of respondents (91.9%), English was the language of the home during childhood. Only 2% reported that they grew up in a home where English and another language were spoken about equally. Of this group, slightly more than half spoke Spanish and English in their childhood home. Other languages mentioned were Polish, German, Italian, Czech, and Dutch.

Slightly over 4% of respondents had used mostly some language other than English in the home (i.e., little or no usage of English). Once again, Spanish was the most frequently cited language, with about 1/4 of this group stating that they had used Spanish only in the home. Other languages mentioned by this group were: Italian, German, Czech, French, Norwegian, Chinese, Japanese, Portuguese, and American Indian.

Slightly more than 40% of the respondents state that they are "familar" with one or more languages other than English (15% say they are familiar with two foreign languages; 3% state that they are familiar with three foreign languages). 16.7% of the respondents say that they are familiar with Spanish (13.5% for French, 11.3% for German, 4.1% for Latin). Fewer than 1% indicate that they are familiar with any of these four important languages: Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Russian.

While approximately 40% claim familiarity with at least one foreign language, only 30% of the population have studied a foreign language in school. By far the largest number of individuals begin their foreign language study in junior high school (grades 7-9) or in senior high school (grades 10-12). Very few Americans put off the beginning of foreign language study until college (2.4%); a very small number have begun their foreign language study in the sixth grade or before (3.8%).

---

1. A more detailed analysis of the survey by Dr. Peter A. Eddy is being published in the fall 1979 issue of the ADFL Bulletin.

The majority of Americans do not engage in long sequences of language study. Almost half of those who have studied a foreign language have studied it for one or two years only. (However, 15% of the group that have studied a foreign language indicate that they have spent five years or more at it.) Overall, though, only 8% of Americans have studied a foreign language for four or more years.

Foreign language learning by Americans is not limited to academic instruction, although the vast majority does appear to take place in school situations. For instance, almost 20% of those who indicate a familiarity with a foreign language say that they have learned the language at home. 18% say that they have learned the foreign language (at least in part) through travel abroad.

Being "familiar" with a language, of course, does not mean that one can use this language. In response to the question, "Are you able to read, write, or speak the foreign language in question?" slightly less than 60% of those claiming to be "familiar" with a foreign language responded in the affirmative. Overall, then, more than three Americans in four cannot speak, read, or write any language but English. Only 8% report that they are able to use two foreign languages; a mere 2% state that they can use three foreign languages.

Although less than 1/3 of the population surveyed have studied a foreign language in school, slightly over 45% indicate a desire to study a foreign language in the future. Over 20% indicated that they want to learn two foreign languages. Spanish is the most popular language: 22% of the respondents indicate a desire to study it. Other languages, in order of popularity, are: French, German, Russian, Italian, Chinese, and Japanese.

When asked whether they have ever used a language other than English to communicate with someone in the United States, about 15% of the total population indicate that they have done so. Spanish is once again the most frequently mentioned language, followed by French, German, Italian, and Polish. The survey attempted to get a measure as well of Americans' usage of foreign languages abroad. Of the approximately 1/3 of the total population that have travelled in a non-English-speaking country, about 57% indicate that they have tried to use a foreign language during their travel.

Those respondents who have studied a foreign language in school (approximately 30% of the total population), were asked whether they felt that the study of that language had been worthwhile. More than 75% of them answered in the affirmative. Practical considerations seem to have the strongest bearing on both positive and negative responses. For instance, the following four reasons account for the vast majority of the positive justifications for language study: "Leads to better awareness and understanding of people from other nations," "Useful for travel," "Increases the ability to read and write English," "Helps to improve grammar." By far the most common negative response is: "No use for it," "Don't need it."

Another measure of the value attached to foreign language study is found in people's responses to the question, "Are you encouraging your children to study a foreign language in school?" Of parents with children aged 16 or younger, 84% indicated that they encourage their children to study a foreign language. Of this same group, 73% indicate that they expect their children some day to have the opportunity to use a foreign language outside the classroom.

Slightly more than 75% of the respondents think that foreign language should be offered in the elementary schools in this country. About 40% of the total think that foreign languages should be required in the elementary schools.

More than 93% of the respondents think that foreign language should be offered in the junior or senior high schools in the United States. Approximately 47% of the population feels that learning a foreign language should be required in junior or senior high schools in this country.

Public support for foreign language requirements at the college level is considerably less than that for requirements at the secondary level. Thirty-eight percent of respondents think that there should be a foreign language requirement for admission to U.S. colleges and universities. Public support for a graduation requirement from American colleges and universities is almost identical (38.2%).

In sum, the results of this survey show that despite recent very visible demonstrations of the linguistic diversity in this nation, the vast majority of the country's citizens have virtually no knowledge of foreign languages. Only 30% of Americans have studied a foreign language in school, for example, and only 8% have studied a language for a long enough period of time (four years or more) for then to begin to have a usable knowledge of it.

This does not mean, however, that Americans' attitudes toward language study are negative. Three quarters of those who have studied a language consider it to have been worthwhile, and 84% of those with children under 16 indicate that they are encouraging them to study a foreign language. Furthermore, more than three quarters of Americans believe that languages should be taught in the elementary schools, and more than nine in ten feel that languages should be part of the junior and senior high school curriculum. Finally, 45% indicate a desire to study a foreign language in the future.

THE MINORITY STUDENT IN THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE FIELD

Louise J. Hubbard, Professor of Foreign Languages
University of the District of Columbia

Fear, distaste, and lack of interest characterize the American attitude toward foreign language study. The fact that understanding of another nation and appreciation of its culture are only possible through its language is minimized. Study of a foreign language in the school curriculum is considered the province of the specialists, of little value to the average student. Today when the need is great, even the presence of foreign languages in the school curriculum is questioned. It is a paradox that in the United States the number of persons with proficiency in a foreign language is limited, although the development and greatness of the nation is the result of the work of speakers of various languages. The cause for the voluntary or involuntary loss of these languages is part of the political and educational history of the United States. With this loss, however, and with the years, a language other than English has come to be viewed by the average American as a subject for classroom study rather than as a medium of communication. To change this attitude calls for an awakening to the imperative of the American's being able to communicate with people of other nations in their language in our country or in theirs. Rodgers, a foreign language educator, comments on the importance of a change in attitude:

> The study of foreign language by Americans, even if it stops short of functional mastery, can still be of great symbolic value, for it can represent a touch of humility, a touch of humanity, a reaching out toward other cultures in the hope of achieving some measure of understanding. Eventually, developing these attitudes may prove to be even more important than producing a few more specialists.[1]

It must be recognized that to supply the growing need for specialists, many students must be engaged in foreign language study to allow for a sufficient number to elect and to complete advanced study. This base for a supply of specialists can result from a higher degree of involvement of minority groups in the foreign language field. Many Americans today are interested in learning more of the history and culture of their forebears of other countries. Study of the language as a key to that heritage should be promoted. The participation of the Hispanic American and other language minorities in bilingual programs obscures the general lack of advanced skills in their home language. A primary concern is the black American who has generally been excluded from foreign language study.

Until recent years the value of foreign language study was perceived to be twofold, as expressed by Nicholas Murray Butler in 1948:

> . . . its contribution to the humanizing influence of a liberal education and the equipment of the college graduate with the ability to make direct contact with the culture and science of at least one foreign country and the people who live in it.[2]

Statements today stress not only the humanistic but the pragmatic and attitudinal values. The 1978 MLA Task Force on the Commonly Taught Languages lists three areas: (1) Practical and commercial values; (2) Humanistic and cultural values; (3) Linguistic and cognitive values.[3] These benefits have been reserved until recently to the segment of the school population preparing for a college education. Although in 1969 the National Association of Secondary School Principals made a recommendation that modern foreign language study should be open to all interested students, and the Office of Education advised in 1963 that adaptation of language teaching to the needs of students should not be confused with a lowering of achievement standards, these suggestions had little, if any, impact. Accepted instantly, however, was the recommendation of Conant that in the urban schools foreign languages have little place. Throughout the years, study of a foreign language has been viewed as elitist, accessible to those with superior mental abilities. Fostered by foreign language teachers, accepted by students, this view persists today. The falling enrollment in foreign language classes in the seventies and the current emphasis on curricula to provide for all pupils led foreign language educators to reexamine and to support foreign language study for all students. This was addressed by the 1970 Northeast Conference. Many in the profession insist, however, that foreign languages can be mastered only by a select group. Without identifying the special talent needed, Gaarder makes an extravagant statement opposing foreign language study for all students:

> I am setting forth a rationale for seeing foreign language students, and enabling them to see themselves as a largely self-selected group of very special people (a kind of elite not better than others but different in a most desirable and rewarding way) . . . The rationale rejects as self-defeating and debasing our present insistence that foreign language study is for everyone, for that insistence is tantamount to our saying to the student: There's nothing special about this or you. You won't distinguish yourself here. It's for everyone.[4]

This conviction that persons knowing a foreign language are "special" appeals to many in the foreign language profession.

Outside of the foreign language profession, some educators believe that foreign language study in the schools is unnecessary, impractical, and a financial burden. Other educators, led by many in the foreign language field say that if the student does not have a certain level of skills in English, he should not be placed in a foreign language class. Use of tests dependent on previously acquired linguistic skills to measure aptitude for learning a new language helped to promote the premise that one must be skillful in English usage to succeed in the study of a foreign language. In fact, students consistently report that studying a foreign language helped them for the first time to understand their own. Studies document the fact that study of a second language leads to increased proficiency in English.[5]

The black American has been counseled out of foreign language study. He has been excluded in some instances because of weak English skills, but especially for a variety of untenable reasons, including his racial physical features, harmful to the self-esteem of the student. The aura of elitism and

difficulty which have accompanied the study of a foreign language left no doubt in the minds of school administrators, counselors, and foreign language teachers that the black student would receive no value from foreign language study, for he would not go to college, he would not travel abroad, and anyway he would fail the course, or if he were to succeed, he would have wasted his time. This attitude was strengthened and the teaching of foreign languages to the black American further eroded by the report of Conant in 1961 and by the sociologists and the psychologists of the period who were probing the characteristics of the disadvantaged child and who reported that teaching foreign languages in the urban school was "educationally futile." This writer pointed out then and repeats now that for the "disadvantaged a modern foreign language course with emphasis on language for communication "offers advantages which are not present in other classes: 1) With English limited to a minimum, the deficiencies of his English speech habits are not cause for disparagement and do not present a barrier to understanding and learning. . . 4) from the first day he can experience pride in personal achievement."6

There are values of foreign language study for the black student as there are for any student. These values are the same for the black American as they are for any American. A black student has the same possibilities of becoming a foreign language specialist as any other student. Some benefits of foreign language study are especially important for the black student, "for black students, through foreign language study, as by no other means, learn indelibly and irrefutably that minority status does not mean inferior, that different means neither better nor worse."7 Self-concept can become positive and self-confidence heightened with the acquisition of even minimal skills in a foreign language.

In recent years linguists have identified a dialect which they name Black English. Dissemination of these findings has led some educators to promote the acceptance of sub-standard English usage in the classroom. The black student who is weak in the use of standard English suffers doubly: he is not aided in the acquisition of his national tongue, and is excluded from mastering a foreign one.

With exclusion of black students from foreign language classes continuing, with the lack of high school and college foreign language requirements, and with the opinion of many black college students who can make a choice that foreign language study has no benefit, few black Americans are studying a foreign language. In 1976-77, of 13,[illegible]4 Bachelor's degrees in foreign languages, 424 were received by blacks. Of 3,147 Master's degrees, 99 went to blacks. Blacks received 14 out of a total of 752 Doctor's degrees.8

Without second language skills and the broadened understandings that accompany development of them, the black American may not be able to take advantage of opportunities for employment. "The most aggressive MBAs may not be perceived as good choices for international work if they lack foreign exposure or can't speak a second language" is stated in reference to banking in a feature issue of Black Enterprise on black Americans and international employment. "While most of us spent our summers hustling to get money so that we could go back to school the next semester", states one black recruiter for a large commercial bank, "the white kids were backpacking across Europe. Now they're the ones being selected for the international work." This advice is given, "Blacks must become more globally oriented. Speak a second language. Understand world geography and economics."9

Knowledge of a second language gives a better opportunity for economic security, future advancement, and job flexibility to all Americans. This is to be especially prized by the black American. Commenting on the rewards of foreign language study for black students, Marie Gadsden, of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, writes, "It seems to me that competence in foreign language study is not merely a matter of rewards for our students; rather, such competence is the sine qua non to effective competition and basic survival in the political, financial, economic, and cultural arena of our contemporary society."[10] Rodgers, addressing the need for foreign language study in black colleges affirms:

> The black graduate must be better, not less prepared, than his white counterpart if he is to move out of monolingual and monocultural isolation. . . . To defer, reduce, or eliminate languages is to deprive further the black student of training in clear, deep thinking, in distinguishing between a concept and the words or symbols used to describe (express) the concept, in manipulating symbols, and in understanding the principles of communication of thought.[11]

The rewards of foreign language study fall not only to the black American as an individual, but also to the nation. The United States will continue to be involved with Third World countries, many of which are African. Some black Americans feel very strongly drawn to Africa, the unknown ancestral continent. Just so, many people of African countries feel an affinity to the black American, the lost relation. The black American who possesses the ability to communicate effectively in his own and in a second language, and who has a deep understanding and appreciation for other cultures gives the United States an edge over other nations seeking to deal with Third World countries and to influence Third World affairs. As of now, however, most black Americans, like most Americans must learn a lot about Africa, especially the realities of language usage: that Swahili is not the ancestral language; that Swahili is not "the" language of Africa; that French is the official language of seventeen African countries, and to get along in those countries one must speak French; that French is widely used in four other countries; that Spanish and Portuguese are also the languages of African countries. This information and opportunity to learn these or other languages should be available to all Americans.

The largest language minority in the United States is the Hispanic American for whom Spanish is the mother tongue. A recent ban, later rescinded, and the accompanying controversy, on the use of Spanish by Hispanic soldiers talking together while on duty in Germany, is indicative of the general American attitude toward languages. Any language other than English is seen as a "foreign" language. Little recognition is given to the fact that a number of Americans do not have English as their first language. There is a disregard for other languages. The voices of officials of other countries on visit to the United States, or of speakers at the United Nations are seldom heard on American airwaves, for only the English translation of the remarks is broadcast. Even when President Carter gave a major address in Spanish, the television coverage of the event overrode his voice so that only the English version was heard.

Linguistic minorities over the years have supplanted their mother tongue by English in order to participate fully in American society and to enjoy its benefits. The process began for a child with complete immersion in the English

language on his first day in school. Today the process is less harsh. Bilingual classes prevent the imposition of an immediately difficult learning situation on the child from a non-English speaking home. The mandated emphasis is on making the learner functional in English. For the Hispanic American Spanish is, therefore, a medium of instruction in the elementary school. His secondary school experience may include little or no opportunity to maintain and develop standard Spanish language skills. There are a number of high schools offering special courses such as Spanish for the Spanish-speaking where classwork is in keeping with student needs. In other cases Spanish-speaking students are placed in the regular Spanish classes to develop their reading and writing skills. Without enormous activity of a dedicated teacher little is developed by the student in this situation except a distaste for Spanish classes. Some efforts are being made to publicize the value for the Mexican American, the Puerto Rican, and the Cuban American of studying Spanish. These values are set forth by concerned teachers:

> The ability to read and write Spanish could well be a vital job skill for such a student--a vital skill which would enable him or her to get a better job with a higher salary, and a skill with which he or she is already partly familiar. Further ore, Hispanic-American students will have a better idea of their own heritage and will understand their own community better if they enroll in a Spanish course and study Spanish cultures.[12]

Primeau points out that the student who has a native background in a foreign language has a distinct advantage in the job market over the student who has only studied the language for several years. He lists career opportunities in the field of international business, social work, and bilingual-bicultural education. For the non-college graduate there are job opportunities in private business for persons with bilingual skills. "Students who have bilingual-bicultural capabilities should be aware of this advantage, combine it with a marketable skill and enjoy the monetary benefits and the personal satisfaction of retaining and utilizing their native heritage."[13] All linguistic minorities, speakers of Chinese and French, for example, should be encouraged and given the opportunity to continue the use of their home language. The benefits heretofore mentioned apply equally to them.

Recommendations

Recommendations to assist minorities in the foreign language field should first consider separately the black American whose native language is English and whose culture is American, and the minorities whose first language is one other than English and who have retained the culture of their ethnic group. The primary recommendation for the black American is that he be included and encouraged at all levels in foreign language study. The primary recommendation for the Hispanic and other linguistic minorities is that they be given the opportunity and the encouragement to maintain and develop their first language skills at all levels of instruction.

National Language Awareness

The advantage and need of language study must be clear to all minority students and their parents. This advantage and need, not only for minorities

but for all citizens, can be stressed with the cooperation of the news media in developing a national language awareness, in letting Americans know how the rest of the world speaks. There has already been a start with a few commercials given in a variety of languages. Seeing and hearing other nationals, on a visit to the United States, or in their countries, using their language should be possible. Informative for the black minority and for all Americans would be the appearance on television of black visitors from countries whose language is French or another of the languages considered to have a "white image", and the appearance of black Americans using other languages fluently in actual situations. Information on languages used in other nations could be given regularly on radio and television. Classes in a variety of languages from beginning through advanced levels could be aired.

Preparation of the Foreign Language Teacher

The aid that would be of great value for all minorities, and for all students, in the foreign language classroom is preparation of teachers whose attitude toward and about all students is positive, and who are sensitive to teacher-learner human relations. "Hispanics are fleeing the traditional language courses in high school because their teachers cannot communicate with them,"[14] advises Carlos Perez, bilingual education specialist. Teacher attitude, divorced from words, can lead to learning or inhibit learning. The tone of the class is set from the first days of the course:

> The words of the teacher, whether in the target language or the native language, are clothed in the teacher's personality as well as in his perceptions and expectations. The teacher's language and behavior communicate to the students his understanding of his role in the classroom, his personal sensitivity to the individual learner, his level of tolerance for error, and his idea of the kind of people who should and who can learn the language he is teaching. The learner on the basis of his perception of teacher attitude and behavior, makes his prediction of teacher performance. Method, materials, and motivation are overshadowed by human relations.[15]

The teacher who does not respect students as individuals or who does not have a deep conviction that all students can learn the language being taught cannot utilize the language learning potential of the minority student. The teacher should be prepared with a variety of techniques and methods and the experience to know which ones work best in different situations and for different learning styles.

Teacher deficiencies in pedagogical or linguistic skills, and the lack of an articulated curriculum, which negates previous years of study of a language, among other weaknesses in foreign language education, affect most deeply the minority student. The difficulties of the student resultant from those weaknesses are for many an indictment of themselves and their ability, and they avoid further blows to their self-concept by rejecting foreign language study.

Foreign Languages in the Elementary School

In response to a questionnaire on what is most needed to assist black Americans in the foreign language field, seven of ten black college foreign language educators selected increased elementary and secondary enrollment in foreign language classes over scholarships for study abroad (which placed second), and supplementary funding for departments. The lack of success of the foreign language elementary program of the sixties was due in part to the nature of the foreign language profession. For, in fact, the FLES program was a success in so far as the children's accomplishments are concerned. A new program with a commitment to all the children in a school, not a selection changing with the fluctuation of a child's grades in other classes should be sponsored. Various successful bilingual programs for the native English speaker exist on the elementary level. One of these may serve as a model for the eighties.

Secondary Education

1. Foreign language instruction on the secondary level should be mandatory for all students with a recognition of the need to service the native speaker of a language other than English and to develop students to varying levels of proficiency. Proposals for international high schools continue the elitist image of language study.

2. Incentives, enrichment, and rewards should be provided, not just for the superior student, but for all who are interested. Day camps in the summer, weekend opportunities for language usage, experiences in nearby colleges, a drama group, all would have an immeasurable impact on development of language skills and of language awareness in the community.

Post-Secondary Education

1. Programs for the preparation of foreign language specialists should be improved and linked to other fields such as business, economics, and sociology.

2. Study abroad should be mandatory for language majors, with scholarships available for students needing them.

3. Clusters of colleges should provide language institutes for their majors.

In-Service Teachers

1. Refresher study/travel programs in countries where the language taught is spoken should be mandatory. Funds should be available for those needing them.

2. Regular newsletters should be sent to all foreign language teachers giving suggestions and reports of successful techniques and activities.

3. Institutes, regional or national, on special themes relating to content, methodology, evaluation, interdependence of nations, among others, should be held regularly for teachers.

Black Colleges

Special attention and support should be given to the predominantly black colleges, for the majority of black Americans earn the undergraduate degree at these schools.

Implementation

1. A national body with regional centers should be set up. This body would receive, prepare, and disseminate informational and supportive materials to all teachers. It would coordinate institute activities, help form cluster groups of higher institutions, among other activities.

2. Federal funding should be available for the above, and for institutes, grants, scholarships, and fellowships.

These recommendations offer little of specific application to a minortity group only, for what is of benefit to the country's minorities is of benefit to all Americans. The students who will be affected by these recommendations will spend the greater part of their lives in the twenty-first century in a community of interdependent nations. America's minorities proficient in languages are needed to form the reservoir from which can come the specialists required for this interdependent community. They may help as well to bridge the way for the United States to its chosen place in this world community.

NOTES

[1] Joseph J. Rodgers, "A Case Study for the Study of Languages in Black Colleges--A Position Paper," Lincoln University, Pa. Unpublished.

[2] Nicholas Murray Butler, Introduction to Newmark, Maxim, ed., Twentieth Century Modern Language Teaching (New York: The Philosophical Library, 1948) p. vii.

[3] "Report of the MLA Task Force on the Commonly Taught Languages," Foreign Language Annals, 11 (1978), 635.

[4] A. Bruce Gaarder, "Elitism, Teacher Training, and Other Forbidden Topics," Modern Language Journal, 60 (1976), 152.

[5] Among other studies, District of Columbia Public Schools, "A Study of the Effect of Latin Instruction on English Reading Skills of Sixth Grade Students in the Public Schools of the District of Columbia," 1971. ED 060 695. This study includes the effect of French and Spanish in addition to Latin.

[6] Louise J. Hubbard, "Modern Foreign Languages for the Racially Disadvantaged," Modern Language Journal, 52 (1968), 140.

[7] Louise J. Hubbard, "Foreign Language Study and the Black Student," CLA Journal, 18 (1975), 565.

[8] Preliminary data. Degrees and other Formal Awards Conferred between July 1, 1976 and June 30, 1977, Department of HEW Higher Education General Information Survey.

[9] "Stepping Out to Step Up," Black Enterprise, February 1978, p. 40.

[10] Marie D. Gadsden, Personal communication on foreign languages and contemporary society.

[11] Joseph J. Rodgers, "A Case Study."

[12] Fabian Samaniego and Mary McElroy, "Promoting Foreign Language Study: Reaching out to Native Speakers," Foreign Language Annals, 11 (1978), 31.

[13] John K. Primeau, "Career Opportunities for Bilingual-Bicultural Students," Bilingual Journal, Winter 1978, p. 14.

[14] Carlos E. Pérez, "Foreign Language Instruction and Bilingual Education," ADFL, 9 (1978), 14.

[15] Louise J. Hubbard, "Aptitude, Attitude, and Sensitivity," Foreign Language Annals, 8 (1975), 35.

UNDERGRADUATE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES: THE STATE OF THE ART AND PRESCRIPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

James E. Harf, Professor of Political Science
The Ohio State University

INTRODUCTION*

This report describes the state of the art in the non-language aspects of graduate international studies and suggests workable recommendations for realizing the goals of the Helsinki Accords as they relate to the American undergraduate student. Its data base is varied. Formal inquiries were solicited and responses subsequently obtained from an adequate sample of specified representatives of universities and colleges of every type and from every region of the country. The views of recipients of federal dollars--past and present grantees of U.S. Office of Education NDEA undergraduate and graduate grants, and NDEA centers--are also heavily represented in this report. The ideas of these groups were obtained in formal survey and via informal discussions which occurred in a variety of settings. Additionally, a substantial number of individuals of non-university organizations and associations--from the 1 Dupont Circle organizations of higher education to individuals of the International Studies Association--contributed ideas and remedies. And finally, the author brings to bear on the task eight years of very active involvement outside of his own campus in the enhancement of undergraduate international studies.**

The thrust of this report is upon the perception of parties vitally interested in international education who are demonstrating this commitment as practitioners at a myriad of institutions of higher learning across the country. Thus, in this report I undertake the task of condensing several thousands of pages of correspondence and notes representing the views of hundreds into a concise report designed to serve as an evaluative summary of what these individuals "out there" think.

STATE OF THE ART

A paradox exists when one tries to summarize the quality and quantity of international education at the undergraduate level. On the one hand, many colleges and universities present glowing pictures of this program or that center, alluding to numbers served and impact made. But on the other hand, recent evidence that only three percent of all undergraduates are enrolled in a course with an international focus*** suggest such a glooming picture that

*This article is a condensed version of the report submitted to the Commission on June 1, 1979.

**The appendix describes the methodology of this study.

***"Education for Global Interdependence," American Council on Education, October 1975. Rose Hayden, Project Director.

the task before us is so overwhelming so as to throw us all into permanent states of extreme depression. But the very fact that so many institutions can allude to pockets of successes might be our very real (and only) hope in a steady state funding situation. It is also not surprising that these success stories can be predicted.

First, the state of the art is good for undergraduates at the very prestigious research-oriented institutions of New England, Chicago, and California with thriving federally-funded centers and programs. Students arrive on campus with high intelligence, a greater than normal range of experiences including international travel, and a commitment to assume an eventual leadership position in adult society. They quickly learn what myriad of international experiences await them on the campus, and soon become side-beneficiaries of campus resources earmarked primarily for a professional/graduate clientele. Responses abound from research centers alluding to this particular outreach function, suggesting that undergraduate students in these kinds of institutions have opportunities for successfully meeting the goals of the Helsinki Accords. To be sure, the global perspective to which many allude may take on a different meaning in the context of the traditional area centers (perhaps to be remedied by the creation of other kinds of centers which are global or problem oriented).

A second group of undergraduates whose international education needs appear to be met are those students of upper middle and upper class families who matriculate at small, prestigious, liberal arts colleges. The choice of geographic area is much more limited at these kinds of colleges than that found at the institutions described earlier. But a large majority of these institutions have committed physical and financial resources to one or two areas, such as extensive faculty and/or student exchange programs, a variety of course offerings, and other extra-curricular activities. Most of the students, moreover, are financially able to take advantage of long-term travel abroad programs, a strategy suggested by many respondents to my inquiry to be essential for achieving cross-cultural understanding. Thus their initial enthusiasm is wetted by experience abroad which reinforces a commitment to engage in post-travel international activities.

For most of the students at an overwhelming majority of institutions of higher learning, however, the American Council on Education quote holds true. They are simply going through their careers without exposure to any non-American experience. This is a fact of life and those of us in Washington and in the prestigious institutions must recognize that our experiences are very atypical. Most institutions of higher learning are very different from our own, and the consequences of this for international education are substantial.

It is not surprising therefore, that representatives of most of the research-oriented institutions have tended to emphasize graduate education and their research mission in pleas before the federal government. For them the undergraduate student is benefiting and will continue to maximize his learning pay-offs as long as resources are channeled into these other areas. It remains, therefore, for the institutions committed to mass education to wave the flag of discontent. Maurice Harari of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities described a number of obstacles to what he termed the democratization of international education in testimony before a House Subcommittee

in 1978. He specifically alluded to the nature of the universities and colleges, the nature of the field, and the nature of faculty training both for careers in some aspect of international education or for the usual academic discipline. And because of these conditions, the problems of meeting the goals of this Commission or any other authoritative body in the field are far greater than the challenges facing the American educational system in 1957 as a consequence of Sputnik. In this latter instance, there was usually one-to-one correspondence between a "unit" of subject matter and a traditional academic discipline. Consequently, if educational goals were to be changed, if curricula were to be adjusted, if large (or small) funds were to be made available, universities were already administratively prepared to handle such "disruptions." The sacred cow of academia, the "department" representing a traditional discipline, was already well entrenched. And in a growth academic economy, this expansion was not viewed in zero-sum terms by those other departments not entrusted with the awesome responsibility of meeting the challenges of the national purpose.

The task was further made easier by the fact that knowledge in these anointed disciplines was cumulative (or at least much more so than in international studies) and there existed a far greater consensus about the parameters of this knowledge base than exists in the fields of our concern. Moreover, the parent professional associations, mirroring the academic departments, were far better able to marshall their resources than the myriad of associations whose interests transcend national boundaries. Whereas more than one discipline was involved, the modus operandi was multidisciplinary rather than interdisciplinary. The disciplines of the sciences were also highly related and their practitioners had enjoyed years of co-mingling in a variety of settings. Thus the federal government and universities (and K-12) could work together rather effectively in pursuit of clearly defined and measurable goals in traditional settings which posed no threats to other segments of the academic enterprise in an era of high growth in all sectors.

Many more formidable obstacles remain today. "Steady state" is the buzz word which characterizes academic budgets. Departments recognize all too clearly that they exist in a zero-sum situation where one person's gain is another's loss. Thus they are suspicious of any emerging program or administrative unit, recognizing quite correctly that the zero-sum principle will be operative. And departments remain paramount in the university hierarchy for two reasons. First, to change such a bureaucratic arrangement would involve no less problem and opposition than similar proposals to reorganize the federal bureaucracy. And second, departments control the one reward coveted most by faculty, tenure. As one OE grant recipient from a major university suggested: "Participation in such (international) programs is a dangerous project for any untenured young faculty as many of ours who never achieved tenure can testify."

The nature of the "field" also creates problems. Indeed there is no field. Terms such as global education, international studies, crosscultural studies, and area studies mean different things to different people. On the one hand, some scholars make clear distinctions, defending their phrase as the pure approach to whatever it is we are about against the lesser strategies of other advocates. Others use these terms in an extremely loose manner, rarely if ever stopping to think about the implications of each term.

Nor is there a consensus about the parameters of the enterprise. For some, particularly many associated with community colleges, it means direct contact with foreign nationals, preferably abroad but also on campus. For others it implies education for "global perspectives." For still others it refers to the traditional area studies with or without language training. Some adopt a problem or issue focus, so that environment, food, energy, and the like are examined as world phenomena. For many (such as the Consortium for International Studies Education) international studies is value free, while for others (such as the World Development Program at Gustavus Adolphus College), the emphasis is clearly value oriented, with human survival and global quality of life desired end-states. For some the sanctity of the nation-state is unquestioned, but for others, world government represents a long-range goal and non-nation-state actors are a focus of inquiry. For many its parameters are limited to the formal classroom setting, while others design a myriad of extracurricular and off-campus activities in order to achieve goals. And finally, for some it implies infusing large segments of the curriculum with an international dimension, while others view it as a clearly defined major or program of study.

THE DATA

Let us examine the data more closely. University and college Presidents were asked eight basic sets of questions. Let us consider each question in detail.

1. What should be the goals of international studies training at the undergraduate level both for individuals who plan a career in some international area and for those who will simply act as informed and responsible citizens?

Responses indicate that there appears to be strong support for goals which yield broad global knowledge with some greater exposure to another culture, preferably a Third World type. As the University of Utah responded, the basic goal of international studies is or ought to be the ability to "perceive, evaluate and behave in different cultural settings, and to become more responsive to the human condition, individual cultural integrity and cultural pluralism."

Of course, some institutions aspire to bolder goals. Consider, for example, Bowling Green (Ohio) State University which simply states: "Our goal is to add an international dimension to the education of all BGSU students."

Most respondents made little distinction--for those on their specific campus--between careerists and those who will simply become part of the informed public. The basic difference suggested by the university representatives tended to focus on the depth of student experience rather than on the breadth. That is to say, single language proficiency should be greater for the former group as well as the amount of immersion in the new culture. There are differences across campuses, however, as a vast majority of student bodies come to the campus with little basic knowledge of the world and less understanding of it.

In sum, there do not appear to be sharp differences with respect to undergraduate goals among the university respondents. And certainly, these were never cast in a global education vs. area studies debate.

2. How do you evaluate the present state of student interest in and demand for instruction? Is it vocationally-oriented? If so, what are the implications of this?

Respondents note that student interest varies from institution to institution. Replies suggest that interest is high at the more prestigious places, although many respond that the same pattern exists elsewhere. But a similar number report the opposite response as well. And for the former group the term "high" typically refers to the numbers involved in a given year vis-a-vis a previous year. No one reports, for example, that even half of the student body has enough interest to enroll in one class with an international dimension. In absolute terms, therefore, the figures are not very encouraging. The one consensus that emerged related to the orientation of this interest. An overwhelming majority of responses alluded to a vocational orientation.

3. How easily is this student interest pursued? Is there an international studies major? Is there special counselling? What is the relationship between curricular and extra-curricular activities in the international area?

Respondents differ with respect to the ease with which students pursue an interest in international studies. Again, conditions are good for the more prestigious institutions, particularly with more traditional options. There does exist somewhat more difficulty in trying to design imaginative options which involve departments and programs outside the traditional liberal arts offerings. Faculty tend to be products of an earlier educational system which required a neatly prescribed obvious pattern of study and, consequently, they appear at even the best of institutions to be unaware of the widely disparate human resources available on their own campus. Counselors have been slow also to develop total knowledge of these resources in order to help students maximize their educational opportunities.

Most institutions have attempted to create a variety of curricular and extra-curricular activities. Respondents tended to list eight or ten different approaches to creating an international climate. One activity greatly in need of support on which there is an overwhelming consensus is student study abroad experiences. These programs flourish on those campuses where students can afford the additional financial burden and where administrators recognize a responsibility not to punish a department's budget because of lower enrollments occasioned by the study abroad programs. But the vast majority of undergraduates cannot take advantage of this experience because of the financial constraint. Respondents consistently praised these programs, recognized their imperative, and argued for support for expansion

4. Should the thrust of any increase in international education be as a separate entity in the curriculum or should it be infused throughout present courses and curricula?

The message from respondents is loud and clear on this issue. Almost without exception, every statement alluded to the imperative of adding an international dimension to all aspects of the students' experiences, as illustrated by the following quote from the University of Cincinnati:

> "An international studies component should be included in every course of study at the undergraduate level."

This strategy of infusing all aspects of the curriculum has won formal acceptance from the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, the parent professional association and accrediting agency for business schools. Their message to its membership is to the point: business schools should internationalize the curriculum.

In addition to the philosophical grounds, there is a practical reason as well for the infusion strategy. Universities must reach out to the student; they cannot wait for the student to come to them. Only by going to the student body, only by adopting as a long-range goal the internationalization of the student's total curricular (and extra-curricular) experiences, only by beginning now to add an international dimension to those parts of the general and specialized curriculum outside of international studies most amenable to such inclusion can universities begin to attack the 97% rate of complete non-involvement in any international experience by the student body.

There is an administrative reason for an infusion strategy as well. As described earlier, university hierarchy is based on the department as the primary unit and a group of departments as the next level. Budgets are typically allocated (in a zero-sum fashion) through this structure. Any suggestion of a new department or, even more threatening, a new kind of program which moves beyond the traditional department model immediately generates advanced levels of proprietary attitudes. In a steady state or declining academic economy, the necessary impact will never be made by advocating, particularly as the single strategy, new curricula, new programs, new departments, and new administrative infrastructures to handle this new set of activities.

In sum, current programs and units are not to be abandoned but are encouraged to expand, to undertake new challenges, to interact with new segments of the university community in order to provide the proper educational environment for undergraduates. This must not be done, however, at the expense of the much more difficult intellectual exercise--the infusion of an international dimension throughout the curriculum.

5. What role should specialized research programs and centers play in reaching out to: undergraduates on the same campus, instructors of undergraduates on other campuses in the immediate geographic area, high school teachers in the vicinity?

An analysis of the NDEA center's and other area responses to my formal inquiry suggest strongly that undergraduates on the campus continue to reap the benefits of an institution's commitment to excellence in area studies.

If these centers continue to thrive, particularly with increased federal support, then those undergraduates on their campuses who wish a rigorous program will be served well. And it is this group of undergraduates who will become actors in the international arena as adults. Thus, one can draw the conclusion that at these institutions undergraduate international studies defined in terms of area experiences is in good shape, although faculty must guard against transforming the undergraduate experience into a professional program with too narrow a focus.

Major universities can marshall human resources if funds are available for such a coordinating effort. Many respondents suggested that small grants ($8,000-$10,000) can be stretched a long way in helping a campus identify and utilize its manpower most effectively.

But what about the undergraduates at 99% of the institutions of higher learning in this country who do not have the campus resources, who do not have faculty who represent knowledge producers at the forefront of their disciplines? Or, if the institutions happen to possess excellence in one area, how is student interest in other areas to be met? As you know, 15% of the formal center's budget is earmarked for outreach. In the responses of consumer institutions, constant references were made to the need to create both formal and informal mechanisms for ensuring that the resources of these programs are disseminated to faculty and undergraduates at other institutions. Respondents called for a variety of models to ensure that at the very least all undergraduates within a specified radius of the research centers could benefit directly and indirectly. The success stories of programs like the Ohio Arms Control Seminar and the West European Studies Program of Columbia and CUNY must be emulated. Respondents clearly indicate, moreover, that success can be achieved with the infusion of <u>much</u> interest with <u>minimal</u> federal support. It is clear, therefore, that the diffusion of knowledge generated at the research centers, and prepared for dissemination by researchers working in cooperation with professionals skilled in such endeavors, offers tremendous hope for significant advances in undergraduate international studies. Lecture series, distribution of pedagogical and research materials, and symposia are typical of the kinds of activities that can be utilized effectively.

A variant on the above strategy was also advocated by many respondents in metropolitan areas. Much can be accomplished by formal consortia and informal arrangements of institutions within a short geographic area. Duplication of programs can be lessened if students can move across institutional boundaries to learn. Proper coordination is essential as is the willingness of academic bureaucracies to allow such arrangments. Minimal funding can yield substantial outcomes in this area as well.

6. What staffing needs do we have in international studies? Have we enough trained teachers? If not, what level of skills do we need?

Respondents differ with respect to the need for <u>additional</u> bodies on campus, and for those who do suggest a need the matter of a formal faculty slot under the normal budget arrangement poses a problem in a steady state environment. It is also clear that there are more perceived needs for slots for specialists in graduate programs, particularly as these programs move away from a traditional area approach to education.

But a different theme flows through the responses to my question, particularly as it relates to the undergraduate side of the educational enterprise. A substantial number of replies allude to the deficient skills of faculty either already employed or on the market today. For example, language instructors may have excellent preparation in the culture of an area but not with respect to global problems. Indeed, before we can introduce a global perspective in the schools, we have to develop one among faculty. Few positions are open, so as a consequence, most undergraduates will be taught in future years by individuals who had either a strict discipline or area training. The former rarely understand another culture well whereas the latter have greater difficulty with contemporary training within the disciplines, particularly the social sciences.

But both are deficient because we now need to convey to students an awareness that today problems cannot be solved by either a discipline or area approach. Global problems are just that, global, and they require a multi-discipline, multi-area approach in order to understand them. Faculty must be retrained to think and converse in these terms.

And I am only talking about faculty who already teach in the area of international studies. What about the vast majority of their colleagues who do not identify themselves or their subject matter as international? How do they develop an international or global perspective? Clearly in-service programs of many kinds must be encouraged and funded.

7. Is it possible and desirable to utilize effectively for instructional purposes at the undergraduate level the linguistic, cultural and area knowledge of foreign students on campus?

Many respondents were quick to answer in the affirmative, although a significant number suggested only under very specific conditions. When non-American graduate students are used in teaching situations, care must be taken to assure that they understand the American educational system. The informal educational settings are not without pitfalls as well. Clearly we need some systematic study of "do's" and "don't's" so that colleges and universities can maximize this resource in a non-exploitative manner.

8. How do you evaluate the quality, coverage, and availability of present teaching material--texts, student learning materials which require an active learning mode, visual aids, etc.? Are our college libraries adequately stocked?

Respondents typically alluded to the need to maintain the quality of library holdings for undergraduates. The large research libraries obviously meet undergraduate needs. Enough people raise the issue and enough experiences exist, however, to demonstrate that there is a need, particularly if the goal of adding an international dimension to as many aspects of the curriculum as possible is to be realized. The experience of the Consortium for International Studies education is also relevant here. This grass-roots organization of international studies faculty has attempted to meet a clearly articulated and documented demand for new student materials of a sub-textbook nature by

developing with governmental and private funding such sets of materials and disseminating literally thousands of copies nationwide during the last six years. This and other movements have also discovered that faculty in-service training, particularly for the faculty generalist typically found at most institutions, in the use of new and innovative materials is an important ingredient to successful utilization in the classroom.

In addition to the formal responses initiated by Presidents of universities and colleges, recipients of undergraduate grants from the U.S. Office of Education were surveyed concerning the needs on their campuses which led to a grant application, their sense of the successes and failures associated with implementing the grant, and any other information deemed helpful for the Commission. Approximately 25% of the grant recipients since the inception of the program in 1972 responded to my inquiry.

The U.S. Office of Education's Division of International Education (DIE) administers a number of programs under a variety of legislation. Most of DIE's programs have been authorized by Title VI (Foreign Studies and Language Development) of the National Defense Education Act, as amended. The Division's activity which most directly impacts on undergraduates is the Undergraduate International Studies Program, designed for institutions (or consortia of institutions of higher learning) who desire to infuse existing general courses and curricula with an international component and to develop new methods of teaching international studies to undergraduates. In FY 1979, 25 institutions were given $875,000. Typically, grantees use program funds for a one-two year period (consortia for one-three years) to revise and update courses and curricula, to develop or increase faculty expertise, or to improve existing resources. New or revised courses represent the essential product, however.

Typically, an institution might introduce a global perspective into a course already termed international or area-oriented. A second purpose is to "internationalize the curriculum," as the recipients are apt to phrase it. In this instance, it is the small two- or four-year institution, perhaps relatively new, that previously offered little or no instruction in international studies. Another type of new course commonly suggested in the undergraduate proposals to OE focuses upon an interdisciplinary thrust, with the most innovative of these combining disciplines which in the past have rarely interacted with each other.

The second major thrust of these grants is the development of international units or sequences which can be used in more general courses. Recipients have tended to focus on what is termed the general education track rather than introducing these components into higher level courses where the subject content is more highly specialized.

Trying to evaluate and analyze the successes and failures is a difficult venture, for the individual most intimately involved in the program is being called upon to pass judgment.

The first major conclusion to be drawn from the responses to my inquiry is that the process was better than the outcome. This was particularly true when materials development was a central part of the grant. As one observer stated, "College teachers are not very good curricular innovators." Most

failed to take advantage--because they were not aware of--existing innovative materials and approaches, preferring instead to try continuously to reinvent the wheel.

My process vs. product comment is not meant to degrade the latter; rather it suggests the strong ripple effect of the grants far beyond their intended outcomes. Many statements suggested that an environment was created on campus which went far beyond the original goals of the grant.

Finally, almost all agree, loud and clear, that these small grants yield a far greater impact dollar for dollar than do larger grants. Administrators from institutions, particularly smaller ones, tend to get actively involved and then carry this enthusiasm into other areas of the institution's academic program. In sum, the grant serves as an incentive for the initiation of an international perspective into the university's mission. And this dissemination often goes beyond the campus. In sum, this program within the Office of Education represents money well spent.

THE SETTING FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Undergraduate international studies, perhaps more than any other of the major foci of this Commission, suffer from a problem of specificity. First, unlike the major research centers, the kinds of institutions which deliver international undergraduate training represent a much greater variety of types. Second, there is much less agreement among leaders in the field concerning the primary and secondary goals of the undergraduate international experience, and when there is a consensus on a particular objective, the difficulties of operationalizing and measuring successful accomplishment are severe.

Consequently, trying to suggest action statements relating only to the undergraduate sector not only ignores the existence of vertical and horizontal linkages, but, more importantly, is counter to most every major suggestion given to this Commission. Namely, if the conscious-raising and knowledge acquisition goals of the Helsinki spirit are to be met, coordination of a magnitude perhaps matched only by the post-Sputnik thrust in science education must be undertaken, natural linkages must be strengthened, and new linkages created. Public consciousness has to be awakened, and once stirred, must be sustained. Leadership in every kind and at every level of the public and private sector must first be convinced of the imperative of our mission, and once convinced, must utilize every tool at its disposal to put into motion the action statements embodied in the Commission's final report.

In a very real sense a national knowledge utilization system must be created which brings together knowledge producers (academic scholars, public and private researchers, pedagogical theorists, learning psychologists) and knowledge consumers (university and college instructors, teacher training instructors, formal students, and the citizenry at large). This system must be put into motion with the "Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval" by political, social, economic, and academic leaders. While the knowledge base has huge gaps as viewed by research scholars at the forefront of their disciplines and by political leaders entrusted with advancing the national purpose, an adequate knowledge base probably exists for our undergraduate consumers. The problems are: the determination of what knowledge ought to be translated for this level

of consumption; the creation of appropriate levels of awareness among key academic decision-makers (principally the traditional line officers) concerning the centrality of the international dimension to all aspects of the curriculum; the development of incentives for faculty to become interested in and capable of internationalizing their instructional domain; the infusion among students of a thirst for a perspective which does not stop at the borders of the United States (a process which begins, as all who have raised the issue before the Commission have suggested, long before the student reaches the university); and appropriate course materials and curricula guides which maximize student learning payoffs while easing this new burden placed on all university/college instructors who already "suffer" from a myriad of institutional and self-imposed pressures.

Embodied in this knowledge utilization system must be a "research and development" sector on the one hand and an "instructional applications clinic" phase on the other. The former must bring together the producers of knowledge (the traditional research scholars) and the translators of knowledge. Ongoing research must be monitored, new knowledge must be evaluated in terms of its appropriateness for the undergraduate consumer, the research must be translated into "usable" knowledge, formal dissemination mechanisms must be created, and the entire process must be evaluated. Programs embodying a "county agent" concept must be generated, pre-professional and in-service programs must be greatly expanded and coordinated at a higher level, informal and formal channels of communication must be developed and, where already in existence, must be brought under a national information system (we must stop trying continually to reinvent the wheel with every new idea and funded project) And key decision-makers at every level of this enterprise must lend their active support in a loud and persistent manner.

This system must take into account the varied nature of the constituency which it serves. And this variety exists as well within the clientele of this report, the undergraduate student. Strategies must be geared to two types of tomorrow's adult population: gladiators and spectators in the international arena. The former represent those who will be active participants in either the public or private international sector.

These gladiators can also be divided in another manner, into two groupings. In the first group are those who will complete their academic education at the end of their senior year. Universities and colleges must ensure that this group of future active participants in the global arena are equipped with both the appropriate level of knowledge about the global system, its component parts, and the vertical/horizontal linkages, and also with an appropriate set of attitudes about this system. A second group of future gladiators will opt for advanced training. In addition to providing the same set of skills for the first group of gladiatiors, universities and colleges must ensure that they continue the kind of training and provide the kinds of programs which will maximize their graduate experience.

The second group of tomorrow's adults will be spectators in the transnational arena. But they too must be served adequately by their undergraduate experience. These transnational spectators can also be divided into two groups. The first are those who will occupy key decision points in our society. They must be sufficiently "internationalized" so that the "multiplier" effect can

operate. For example, if tomorrow's local banker who is also president of the local school board has been sufficiently sensitized by his/her undergraduate experience to the imperative of internationalizing all aspects of our formal and informal educational experiences, then it will be far easier to implement the K-12 goals of this Commission in the years ahead.

The second group of spectators will be non-key decision-makers in tomorrow's society. But this group represents the largest segment of the American voting public. To the extent to which the Commission accepts the view that public officials react to numbers, then this group too becomes a critical target area. Universities and colleges have a responsibility to create an environment for that segment of this latter group which is enrolled in their undergraduate programs.

The realization of this all-encompassing system must serve as the ultimate goal of this Commission. You must begin by urging that selected steps be started immediately. First, as Carol Baumann stated, "The President..." must make the 'internationalization' of the American public a priority.... He must use his "good offices" to convince key decision-makers and the American public throughout the country of the imperative of implementing the spirit of Helsinki. The Commission as part of its final report should prepare the statement which eloquently and forcefully makes the case.

Second, a national campaign to sensitize the American public to the importance of creating an international awareness among the citizenry must be instituted. This campaign can take a variety of forms. One suggestion is the creation of an International Education Year with all the appropriate publicity activities associated with such an activity. Popular media must be utilized effectively to convey the message. This recommendation flows logically from the fact that unless a major segment of the public is sensitized to the critical nature of the challenge, change of the magnitude desired by this Commission will never occur.

Third, a national campaign must be instituted to convince key decision-makers to implement substantive recommendations in the final Commission report. With respect to the higher education sector, the governing boards of both private and public institutions must be a principal target. Once they are convinced about the imperative of the mission, then all line officers--Presidents, Vice-Presidents for Academic Affairs, Deans of <u>all</u> the colleges--must be both sensitized and presented with ways to implement the goals for higher education. Note that I am not talking about the personnel on campus already involved specifically in international studies. Rather, it must be the line officers. This is particularly critical if (a) we take seriously the need to create an international dimension to all aspects of the curriculum, and (b) <u>substantial</u> change in the context of <u>minimal</u> increases in funding is to be the norm.

Fourth, the present federal bureaucratic structure for international education must be changed to reflect the importance of this mandate. Citizens, policy-makers, and academics must be able to identify a visible all-encompassing unit in Washington which oversees international education in this country and supervises the entire federal role in this endeavor. There must be a single place where academic leaders in international studies throughout the nation can turn for leadership.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Specific recommendations for governmental, private, and institutional action are found throughout the earlier sections of this report. Additionally, others flow logically from the discussion of the current situation in undergraduate international studies and desired changes advocated by respondents. These recommendations are now presented in summary form for your consideration.

RECOMMENDATION No. 1 - The international component of the undergraduate experience must not take place in a vacuum as an isolated set of activities. Rather, it must be integrated completely into every aspect of the undergraduate curriculum.

RECOMMENDATION No. 2 - Funds should be allocated by the federal government for the development and dissemination of a model(s) for the infusion of the undergraduate curriculum with an international dimension (Cost: $100,000)

RECOMMENDATION No. 3 - Funding should be made available in small sums (under $40,000) for institutions to begin the process of introducing the internationalization of the curriculum.

RECOMMENDATION No. 4 - Funds should be allocated by the federal government for the design and dissemination of a basic course in global perspectives. (Cost: $100,000)

RECOMMENDATION No. 5 - A monograph should be commissioned which demonstrates the vocational opportunities available to students with a major international component to their program. This should receive the widest circulation. Popular media should be provided with commercial messages for transmission. (Cost: $200,000)

RECOMMENDATION No. 6 - In addition to the traditional area centers, a number of centers of comparable magnitude for transnational studies, global studies, and specific transnational problems should be created. These should have an extensive outreach function. (Cost: $100,000 per center)

RECOMMENDATION No. 7 - Major knowledge-producing centers must be given a mandate as part of the requirements for funding and incentives to engage in extensive outreach programs with both the undergraduate clientele at their own institution and all undergraduate institutions within a specified geographic radius. (Cost: 15% outreach should be maintained)

RECOMMENDATION No. 8 - Local consortia arrangements should be encouraged and seed funds provided. (Cost: $8,000 per)

RECOMMENDATION No. 9 - Funding must be provided by the federal government for campus inventories of human resources. (Cost: $10,000 per institution)

RECOMMENDATION No. 10 - Funding must be provided for both international and non-international faculty educational travel abroad. (Cost: $3,000 per person)

RECOMMENDATION No. 11 - Funding must be made available for financially disadvantaged students to study abroad. (Cost: $3,000 per person)

RECOMMENDATION No. 12 - The undergraduate international studies program in the Office of Education should continue to be funded at the same level per grant but with the number of grants substantially increased. (Cost: $40,000 per increase in number of grants)

RECOMMENDATION No. 13 - A national center for the dissemination of information on undergraduate programs, materials, human resources, and similar topics should be put into operation. (Cost: $100,000 per year)

RECOMMENDATION No. 14 - Funding should be provided for national and regional faculty in-service training workshops. (Cost: $15,000 per national and $5,000 per regional workshop)

RECOMMENDATION No. 15 - Particular emphasis should be placed on the encouragement and funding of programs which show the cooperation of liberal arts and the professional schools.

RECOMMENDATION No. 16 - A study should be commissioned and the findings published of the proper use of foreign students as a resource. (Cost: $50,000)

RECOMMENDATION No. 17 - Funding must be made available to materials developers for the creation of materials of an international nature for inclusion in general courses. (Cost: $150,000 per year)

APPENDIX

The strategies employed for acquiring data were varied. First, letters were sent to the following constituencies asking for such an input:

1. Past and present recipients of U.S. Office of Education NDEA International Studies Undergraduate Level grants (115 awards for 1972-79)

2. Past and present recipients of U.S. Office of Education NDEA International Studies Graduate Level Grants (56 awards for 1972-79)

3. NDEA Centers for International and Language Area Studies (80 awards for 1976-79)

4. Private organizations listed in the Directory of Resources in Global Education who are active in undergraduate international studies (56 in number)

5. Total membership of the International Studies Association, the parent professional association for undergraduate international studies instructors in the social sciences (2000+ members)

6. University and college Presidents from every post-secondary institution in the country (3000+ in number)

These six groups were asked relatively similar sets of questions. How did each view the state of the art? From each group's perspective, what needs to be done and how can these priorities be accomplished? If one was a recipient of federal money, what was its purpose? How successful was the recipient in meeting the goals of the program? What did not work. What should be done in the future? In addition, the international directors of the major professional associations at 1 Dupont Circle were interviewed (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, International Council on Education for Teaching, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and the American Council on Education). An extensive session was held with the Federal Relations Committee of the International Studies Association, chaired by Thomas Stauffer of the American Council on Education. Meetings were also held with selected faculty on the campus of the following institutions of higher learning (Duke University, University of Pittsburgh, University of Texas at Dallas, several Ohio colleges) in order to obtain the views of a wide range of faculty from different types of institutions. Special attempts were made to solicit ideas in public forum and in private conversations with participants at national and regional professional meetings. Particular attention was paid to the community and junior colleges. Additionally, phone conversations were held with numerous individuals in key positions. And, finally, I attended all Commission hearings except the first one in Chicago.

A list of universities who formally responded prior to my writing of the report is given below. It should be noted that approximately 100 institutions responded after the data were analyzed. A reading of this second set of letters suggests a clear agreement with the views of the original set.

FORMAL UNIVERSITY RESPONSES

University of Maryland
Michigan State University
University of Oregon
The William Patterson College of New Jersey
City College of San Francisco
J.F. Drake State Technical College
Prestonsburg Community College
State University College Postsdam, New York
Middlesex County College
Tidewater Community College
Grand Valley State
California State University Los Angeles
Laboure Junior College
Boise State University
University of Missouri St. Louis
Milwaukee Area Technical College
Oregon College of Education
Hobart & William Smith College
Central Virginia Community College
United States Naval Academy
New England College
Golden Valley Lutheran College
Talladega College
University of Wisconsin Oshkosh
Hagerstown Junior College
Syracuse University
State University of New York at Binghamton
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville
Northwood Institute
State University of New York Agricultural and Technical College
The Ohio State University
Emporia State University
California State University, Northridge
Clayton Junior College
Orange Coast College
Linfield College
Clark Technical College
Idaho State University
University of Wisconsin Eau Claire
Oklahoma City University
Central Missouri State University
South Dakota State University
Sioux Falls College
Augustana College
Loretto Heights College
Hawaii Loa College
Kearney State College
Monroe Community College
Georgia Southern College
Florida Junior College at Jacksonville
Memphis State University
Eastern Montana College
University of Nebraska at Omaha
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
University of Nebraska at Lincoln
Winthrop College
Duke University
Urbana College
Vanderbilt University
United States Air Force Academy
Hiram College
Assumption College for Sisters
Eastern Michigan University
Pomona College
The University of Texas at Dallas
McHenry County College
West Georgia College
The University of Utah
Illinois Valley Community College
California State University Long Beach
Molloy College
Bethany Nazarene College

University of Florida
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Our Lady of the Lake University of San Antonio
American University of Beirut
Herbert H. Lehman College
Brookdale Community College
Baptist College at Charleston
Bronx Community College of CUNY
California State College San Bernardino
Savannah State College
LaSalle College
University of Rochester
Occidental College
Boston University
University of California Irvine
Southwest Texas State University
The Medical College of Wisconsin
The University of Alabama at Birmingham
The University of South Dakota
United States Army Infantry School
Lake City Community College
The College of White Plains of Pace University
Massachusetts College of Art
Coe College
College of Notre Dame California
Palm Beach Junior College
North Central Connecticut
Western Michigan University
State University College Fredonia, New York
Lorain County Community College
Weber State College
The American College
The University of Tennessee
Reid State Technical College
Columbia College
Cape Fear Technical Institute
Wheaton College
Suomi College
Virginia Military Institute
Holyoke Community College
Dillard University
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Elmira College
Colby College
Central College
Pasadena City College
St. Louis Community College
El Centre College
Greenville Technical College
Indiana University
Norwich University
Lamar University
Corning Community College
Avila College
Mitchell College
Florida International University
Westark Community College
Bethel College
Saint Anselm's College
Eastern Shore Community College
University of Minnesota Technical College
Hood College
Nebraska Wesleyan University
Mars Hill College
Northwest Mississippi Junior College
University of Wisconsin Green Bay
The University at Albany
Northern Oklahoma College
University of Miami
Central Michigan University
Loras College

Montgomery County
Community College
University of Cincinnati
Rockland Community College
Mills College
College of Environmental
Science and Forestry of
SUNY
Kishwaukee College
University of Pittsburgh
Southern Connecticut State
College
Jackson State University
Grays Harbor College
Eastern Kentucky University
St. John Fisher College
North Iowa Area Community
College
Rice University
Holy Family College
The University of New Hampshire
Bowling Green (Ohio)
State University
Central Maine Medical Center
Northwest Mississippi
Junior College
University of Pennsylvania
Wingate College
Lock Haven State College
St. Edward's University
University of Colorado
at Boulder
Dickinson College
Valencia Community College
Stephens College
State University College
Cortland, New York
Ferrum College
Santa Barbara City College
Northwestern State University
of Louisiana

AREA CENTER RESPONSES

The University of Washington

The University of Chicago

Princeton University

University of Pittsburgh

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Western Washington University

Georgetown University

Indiana University

Tufts University

The University of Michigan

University of Oregon

The University of Texas at Austin

Yale University

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Tulane University

The Ohio State University

UNDERGRADUATE GRANT RESPONSES

Rutgers University, Cook College
The Johns Hopkins University
Oregon College of Education
Southern Connecticut State College
St. Lawrence University
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville
Elgin Community College
The University of Vermont
Boston University
Rocky Mountain Gerontology Consortium
Consortium for International Studies Education
Los Medanos College
San Francisco State University
Rice University
University of Houston at Clear Lake City
Colgate University
Columbus Technical Institute
Stetson University College of Law
Pensacola Junior College
St. Louis Community College
Fordham
State University at Binghamton
Macalester College
Gustavus Adolphus College
The College of Staten Island
Illinois State University
University of Colorado
Kalamazoo College
Kirkwood Community College
Oklahoma State University
University of Cincinnati
The University of Kansas
Donnelly College
Monroe Community College
The Ohio State University
University of Massachusetts

GRADUATE FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Roger Paget

Visits to some forty universities* across the United States left no mistake that the state of international studies at the level of advanced training and research is deeply imperiled. The litany of grief extended through every type of institution, from the largest of state universities to the wealthiest of ivory towers. "The disintegration of international studies must be absorbed," said a representative of Harvard, "It's not just to expand; it's to retard collapse." This report will have, therefore, some marks of a jeremiad, lightened, one may hope, by the spirit of candor and constructiveness implicit in the generous assistance of hundreds of university students, faculty and administrators.

There is a small but important area of agreement across the country as to what is needed to improve international studies: More money for program operating costs, more library support, more fellowships, more study abroad, and more sensible bureaucrats in Washington. But beyond that there is a huge area of profound confusion and disagreement. Discussion of any particular issue more often than not is quickly enveloped and buried in the byzantine intricacy of specialized academic interest groups. In a group dominated by East Asianists, for instance, an attempt to discuss language needs can quickly devolve into a debate over whether "certain librarians should be allowed to get away with their refusal to adopt the new Peking-promulgated transcription system." If a high school teacher is present, she might react the same way a Lexington, Massachusetts, teacher did: "Please be less remote. If you could hear a tape of what you have said today, you would be appalled. It is as if you are from another planet."

Foreign language and international studies have escalated in complexity and confusion consistent with the emerging realization that scarcely any field of study or level of education is free of international dimension. A net

---

*The American University, Boston University, Brown University, University of California, Berkeley, University of California, Los Angeles, Catholic University of America, University of Colorado, Boulder, University of Colorado, Denver, Colorado State University, University of Connecticut, Cornell University, Denver University, Duke University, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, University of Florida, University of South Florida, Georgetown University, University of Georgia, Georgia State University, Harvard University, University of Hawaii, University of Illinois, University of Kansas, Lehigh University, Lewis and Clark College, University of Maryland, College Park, University of Minnesota, Moravian College, City University of New York, Graduate Center, State University of New York, Binghamton, University of North Carolina, Northwestern University, Oregon State University, University of Oregon, Portland State University, Princeton University, Rutgers University, University of South Carolina, Tulane University, University of Washington, Seattle, Wesleyan University, Willamette University.

115

conclusion of this report, reflected in its set of recommendations, is that along with substantially increased funding, a greater magnitude of order must be imposed upon advanced training and research. The order must be sensible, but it also must of necessity be arbitrary.

Discussion at the universities visited involved top administrators, deans, department chairpersons, program directors, faculty and, occasionally, students. Their academic fields included all of the arts and sciences, agriculture, engineering, business, education, journalism, architecture, medicine, law and public health. Persons associated with languages, area studies and other explicitly international studies programs featured most prominently. Some meetings were large and diverse. Others were small and homogeneous in discipline or interest. Many sessions were with single individuals.

Out of these discussions emerged a mosaic of strengths and weaknesses, a picture which while applicable in its entirety to the views of no single institution does in fact capture salient features across the nation in major institutions as a whole.

The list of weaknesses is far more extensive than the list of strengths, perhaps brutally so, and it must be conceded that the disparity probably is exaggerated. It is in the nature of this sort of investigation that when opportunity presents itself, sluices of grievance open wide. We shall begin with the list of strengths.

Strengths

1) The number and high quality of specialists.

Unquestionably, as a number of studies attest, U.S. universities now enjoy the presence of many thousands of superb specialists in many facets of international studies. The major contributive factor was the advent of the National Defense Education Act in 1958, especially the Title VI programs. Area studies centers, professional schools of international studies and a number of social science and humanities programs are the principal vehicles through which these people were trained. However, an important ingredient of success has been the presence of hundreds of emigré scholars, mainly from Europe, many of whom are now approaching retirement.

2) The number of first-rate programs.

For each global region there are now comprehensive centers which are recognized as among the best in the world. This is true also for certain topical subjects, such as food, nutrition, population and energy.

3) The growing geographic distribution of international studies.

One of the most notable findings of the investigation is the strength of international studies in many universities other than those traditionally acknowledged to have major programs. This is especially noteworthy with regard to professional school activities.

4) The number and size of major library specialized research collections.

5) The number of foreign students and foreign scholars now associated with area and other international studies centers.

6) The growing prominence of the international studies dimension of professional school curricula and research.

7) The declining parochialism within international studies fraternities.

Or, conversely, the growing awareness of a) the need to translate esoteric knowledge into formats intelligible to a larger public, b) the importance to international studies of applied science and professional school disciplines and perspectives, and c) the possibility that there are things the United States needs to learn from other societies' accomplishments.

8) The growing variety of educational styles in international studies programs.

A prominent factor here is the emergence of major programs outside the traditional geographic concentrations in the Northeast, Midwest and West Coast and beyond the select few institutions which have been dominant. The impress of professional schools has also had effect in a field traditionally dominated by humanities and social sciences.

9) Individual initiative.

Usually, it is individual faculty members, occasionally individual administrators, who when given opportunity and encouragement are the critical ingredients in building strong programs and moving boldly in new directions. Despite the burgeoning bureaucratization both of university life and of relationships with funding agencies, the unique individual on campus has continued to be the principal agent of growth and innovation in international studies.

Weaknesses

The weaknesses are listed seriatim and are divided into several categories: funding, national organization, campus organization, fellowships and information. These categories help to simplify the presentation, although the boundary lines between them are often rough. Like the list of strengths the list of weaknesses is based on the frequency and intensity of comments received verbally or in writing from individuals and groups at the universities examined.

Funding

1) Decline in funding sources for operating costs.

This problem is endemic. Its magnitude is amply described elsewhere in this volume and in the Commission report. Its substance is detailed in hundreds of studies by government agencies, professional associations, foundations, university committees and individuals. On no campus visit did the decline in funding fail to be identified as a critical weakness affecting the welfare of foreign language and international studies.

The major hope rests on expansion of federal programs, especially those located in the Department of Education, which is the primary outside source of funding for international studies in most universities fortunate enough to have formal programs. Yet the meager level and progressively declining value of current appropriations represent formidable obstacles to reform. A doubling or tripling of current appropriations might arrest the deterioration of existing international studies programs but would scarcely suffice either to restore combined federal and foundation funding levels of ten years ago or measurably to expand the quantity of advanced training and research across the nation. In Congress a request for a two hundred or three hundred percent increment could seem patently outrageous.

University programs are caught in a terrible bind. On the one hand they are rewarded for fiscal responsibility. Every conceivable bit of evidence is packed into federal grant applications to demonstrate that the money requested will constitute only a small percentage, next to what the university itself will contribute, of program operating costs. On the other hand, when university programs cast an image of virtual fiscal independence, outsiders can logically conclude that current federal funding levels are adequate, perhaps even excessive. The application and reporting process has gradually evolved into a massive charade, highly consuming of human energy and ingenuity, and damaging both to educational mission and to accurate assessment of the financial plight of international studies.

Some university personnel are genuinely proud of their ability to avoid "soft money" dependency and allude frequently to the horror stories associated with programs which allowed themselves to be gulled by the promise of durable outside support. More often these "hard money" advocates appear ambivalent, wishing that outside support for international studies could be both substantial and durable but resigning themselves to the hard reality. At one of the public universites most prominent for its international studies programs a vice-chancellor stated contemptuously, "Present allocations of funding [in international studies] are so small that they barely reach the noise level." His institution houses five major area studies centers.

Many center directors have mastered the present funding systems and are wary of changes which might entail painful adjustments and new strategies of competition. Privately they share the dominant sentiment of internationalists across the country that reform is desperately needed--in the shape of sharp increase in federal contribution, greater sophistication and variety of funding programs, and extension of international studies education to enable it to respond to the needs of population centers and all states.

2) The thirty year history of fitful starts and stops in national funding initiatives.

This legacy now contributes to the generally gun-shy attitude of educators and others concerning the prospects for resurgence. The worst period came in the aftermath of the 1966 International Education Act when educators in many states geared up for a major advance only to be yanked up short when Congress failed to provide any appropriations. The memory is vivid, especially in those states whose institutions had little or no absorptive capacity in the

form of previously existing programs. In 1979 alone many hundreds of thousands of dollars have been consumed in differently sponsored major studies of what can be done. Many educators express the view that the problems of international studies have been studied to death many times over. They are skeptical that much will come of it all, and they are reluctant to take much risk.

3) The short-term cycles of funding.

It is an almost universally accepted truth among educators that no complex university program initiative (and international studies is inherently complex) can develop satisfactorily within the constraints of a one, two or even three year cycle. Even the major, well-established centers are forced by the present system to operate in a hand-to-mouth mode. In fact, the major centers may be expecially disadvantaged, since they are expected "to go for the long haul," to undertake basic research, to tackle tough projects requiring many years of perseverance. Short-cycle funding guarantees poor planning, prodigious non-educational paperwork, and avoidance of experimentation or risk-taking. The operation of major specialized library collections probably warrants ten or twenty year cycles, but expression of this need is muted by fear of ridicule.

4) Grossly inadequate funding support for major library collections.

Acquisitions, cataloging, maintenance, periodicals, inter-library loan programs--all of these spheres entail extraordinary expense. The problem is exacerbated as such centers increasingly serve users nationally and internationally. National and regional advances in systems and technology will help to alleviate library burdens, but most of the extraordinary requirements of specialized collections will endure.

5) Inadequate structure of funding programs vis-à-vis qualitative as distinct from quantitative needs nationally.

Perhaps one-third of the present eighty (formerly 106) Title VI centers are commonly identified as "the majors." Nearly all the centers, however, are basically Ph.D.-oriented, and are located in academically prestigious institutions, many of them beyond commuting distance of major population centers. The great bulk of federal and foundation funding has gone to high quality programs at the most advanced end of the educational spectrum of "advanced training and research."

While few respondents registered objection to the qualitative orientation of past funding programs, many argued persuasively for the addition now of separate, more quantitatively oriented, approaches. By quantitative, they meant a concern for reaching a much larger percentage of the nation's graduate students and faculty. To accomplish this end, several steps were urged. Many of the existing centers should gradually redirect their attention to the junior, or M.A., level of graduate education. New programs should be established, so that citizens in major population centers and in most, if not all, states will have convenient access to solid graduate education in international studies. Such centers should serve the needs not just of the immediate institution but of school teachers, two and four year college faculty and others in the region as a whole. Similarly, professional schools should be given incentive to build

international studies dimensions into their curricula and to develop spheres of cooperation with centers and with appropriate language, social science and humanities faculty. Finally, overlap between the upper levels of undergraduate education and the junior level of graduate training should be encouraged so as to incorporate international studies more efficiently into the higher education of a large number of citizens.

The substantial funding assistance which implementation of these programs would require was widely believed to be justified by the expected result of vastly heightened, nationwide, citizen awareness.

6) Lack of coordination of federal funding programs.

Administrators, program directors and senior faculty repeatedly lamented the failure of government agencies to coordinate their efforts. They sympathized with the civil servants' problems of understaffing and of having to peer through a bureaucratic maze. They believed nonetheless that the vertical lines of funding, e.g., Agency for International Development (AID) to schools of agriculture, National Institute of Health ((NIH) to schools of public health and medicine, Office of Education (OE) to centers, were contributing to the difficulty on university campuses of moving across schools and colleges in potentially cooperative ventures.

7) Poorly designed, fickle, and often punitive nature of state funding programs for public universities.

Much of the financial burden for foreign language and international studies has been borne at the state level. Until recent years it was largely an unseen burden, since university administrations were permitted considerable latitude in the handling of allocated funds. The modest administrative requirements and other needs of the various international studies operations usually could be adequately supported even though these operations straddled standard units, were low in profile and were relatively informal in nature. The enormous aggregate of faculty salaries was absorbed in the individual department or college budgets. With zero-base and line-item budgets, state commissions of higher education, constantly vigilant legislative committees and elaborate monitoring practices, administrative flexibility has vanished on many campuses. In its place is a system which at best is neglectful of educational responsibility in foreign language and international studies and at worst is deliberately punitive and destructive. Several program directors propose that under present circumstances a state's authorities should identify the strongest programs across the state-wide system and focus appropriate monies more directly upon them. Funding for weak or duplicative programs should be discontinued, they argue.

8) The virtual disappearance of funding for summer programs.

Several federal programs now extinct, such as the language training institutes for teachers, were generally regarded as highly successful. Summers represent a substantial block of time, essential to international studies, which should be exploited--for efficient language training domestically and abroad, for specialized country and topical seminars and for other programs designed to exploit the skills and serve the needs of individuals widely dispersed during the regular academic year.

National Organization

9) Unpredictability, erratic behavior and generally low quality of the administration of federal programs.

This was a uniform complaint from center directors and other faculty and administrators who had had to deal directly with federal agencies. In most cases the specific object of spleen was the agency most directly associated with center activities, i.e., the Office [now Department] of Education (OE). Some individuals recognized the duress under which international education personnel have had to work: the reduced bureaucratic status of international education, the radical reduction in number of professional personnel, the annual trauma of whether there will be any funding at all, the gradual net decline of monies finally appropriated, the increase in the number and kind of programs among which the shrinking pie must be divided, the proliferating miasma of often extraneous regulations, and the low civil service grade levels to which international education personnel are restricted.

This recognition has not assuaged the consternation invariably expressed by persons on the receiving end of the OE programs. In their judgment the quality of administration has diminished seriously over a twenty year period. Personnel are recruited who have no experience in the world of language and area centers. Ill-considered, hastily contrived, major programmatic changes are generated by fiat with devastating impact upon international studies nationwide. Peer review panels in recent years have reflected the personal whims of key personnel and have included few academics of recognized stature. Capriciously promulgated regulations and guidelines are followed by equally capricious application of them. "How outreach was incorporated into the funding programs for area studies forced universities to resort to fraud," acknowledged one dean of international education. A center director at another institution stated, as if in echo, "There has been a cynical annual reorganization of priorities in outreach." The lower the status and magnitude of OE's international education operation have become, the more the administrative process has suffered from extraneous political, bureaucratic and other non-professional influence. The more limited alternative sources of funding have become, the more seriously the deficiencies of OE have loomed in the eyes of center directors and other university administrators.

Center directors despite their litany of criticism are generally quick to exempt one or two of the government officials with whom they have dealt, but it is worth noting that the names cited are seldom the same from one center to the next. The same tends to be true of individuals singled out for special castigation. One may infer that the core of legitimate criticism really lies more in deficiencies of administrative system than in the poor performance of individual civil servants.

10) Negative sanctions for educational innovation.

This issue is closely tied to the problem of federal funding programs for operating costs (see Weakness No. 1) and to the problem of structural inertia on university campuses (see Weakness No. 16). The negative sanctions are systemic, programmatic and administrative. To some extent they are inevitable,

a consequence of the evolutionary and fragmentary nature of legislation and the nature of the university activities affected. One could say there is a system of federal funding programs in international studies. But there is no such system in the sense of coordinated activity spanning various agencies. Many people point out rightfully that there is advantage in a "system-less system." Otherwise, the total pool of money available to universities for international activities might be far smaller and the federal authority structure more monolithic and immovable. The present system discourages innovation, because (as already reported above) the diverse separate parts interrelate with separate parts of the university and in so doing offer sanction against cooperative ventures which ought to be crossing college, school and department boundaries.

Programmatic and administrative sanctions are somewhat different and perhaps more amenable to change. Title VI, for instance, allowed great flexibility in terms of how OE might construct area and language center programs. Unfortunately, a dysfunctionally elaborate system of grading categories has evolved for the judging of grant applications. Voicing a commonly held view one center director stated that, "The productivity of a center should be measured by its total institutional impact." Instead, center applicants must work to mount up points within highly prescriptive categories and must contrive to use the proper amount of currently popular OE buzz words and concepts. Through such practices, inadvertent as they often are, an administrative exercise in a federal office becomes a negative sanction for educational innovation. Given the flexibility of legislative mandate, this could change, fortunately, either through new bureaucratic appointments or through collective pressure by academic consumers.

11) Lack of attention to educational and post-educational career patterns.

Whenever groups purporting to represent national interests meet to discuss international studies, they are careful to pay homage to the precept that federal programs must not violate the autonomies and sensibilities of state and local educational institutions. This attitude, very wise politically, has tended to deflect attention away from several serious problems. First, lack of continuity in foreign language and international studies from K-12 through undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate education appears to be an important factor in explaining why the subject matter has remained insecure and relatively unpopular within the educational levels severally. Second, failure to assess systematically and regularly the relationship between kinds of international studies education and potential remunerative career opportunities may have contributed to inaccurate expectations on the part of educators and ignorance of the utility of such training on the part of employers. Third, the absence of any pool of substantive, comprehensive, readily available and up-to-date information on job opportunities for persons with foreign language and international studies training may have exaggerated the impression among many educators that employment for graduates is scarce, difficult to locate and often only tangentially related to the subjects studied.

The history of past attempts to raise citizen awareness and support is not good. The assumption that the influence of Title VI centers would ripple out and trickle down was wrong, the valiant efforts of a few of them notwithstanding. An attempt to blanket all educational levels with federally supported, separate, largely unrelated, incentive-type programs may prove equally inadequate to the task.

We may have to bite into the unpalatable question of whether to establish more direct, coordinated, control. In several instances, when the federal government has recognized a course of action to be in the national interest, it has established, from the top down, massive industries replete with suitably funded major university programs and virtually guaranteed job opportunities. Foreign language and international studies may not be sufficiently homogeneous or commercially adaptable for this kind of solution, but the issue of superordinate national interest may have to be faced.

12) The disproportionate emphasis on quality to the detriment of quantity in international studies educational opportunities. (See Weakness Nos. 1, 5)

13) The rudimentary level of in-service training, for school teachers, for two and four year college faculty, for business and labor people, for media personnel and for others.

This is too big and too important an activity to be consigned to the umbrella outreach concept. Nor can already overburdened foreign language and international studies faculty be expected to shoulder this responsibility as an extra fringe benefit.

14) Inaccessibility of most major centers for most potential users. (Most dimensions of this problem are covered in Weakness No. 5)

Major centers cannot change location, but they can be assisted to enable more users to come to them and to enable more of their faculty and other mobile resources to operate more effectively nationwide.

15) Inadequate exploitation of domestic minority groups.

With some 138 ethnic backgrounds and dozens of minority, but substantial, active language groups, the U.S. should be able to enhance foreign language and multi-cultural learning in part through domestic exposure to our own "international" populations. While residence in Hawaii cannot substitute for actual experience in an Asian or Pacific community, it can serve fruitfully as a venue for many mainland citizens seeking a relatively inexpensive and semi-authentic environment for learning about several Asian and Pacific cultures. Obviously this is only one among many examples of how the country could learn from, and serve, its own minority groups.

Campus Organization

16) Inherent structural weakness and vulnerability of foreign language and international studies on almost all campuses.

The problem is pervasive and often reported to be intractable. International studies, whether in the form of area studies, topical studies, or subelements of disciplines, does not fit neatly into conventional university structures. Faculty are spread out among departments, but an individual almost invariably is a member of only one of them.

Customarily, international studies when it is a formal entity resides in a college of arts and sciences. Area studies centers may be loosely related

within international studies, but all will generally fit structurally under the college dean. The dean rides herd on several dozen semi-autonomous departments, each with its piece of the college's budgetary pie. Centers almost never have department status, nor do their representatives sit on councils or committees which are influential in assisting a dean in his budgetary decisions. So long as their soft money coffers remain healthy, centers can maintain a certain degree of independent stature and operational latitude. When such support lapses, a center's inherent structural weakness becomes quickly apparent. It is a difficult circumstance in the best of times, but when a university faces general budgetary setback, such as at present, a center's exclusion from the formal structure of budgetary advocacy and representation can be crippling.

The problem of campus structure is further complicated by the fragmentation of international studies into a number of separate budgetary and administrative activities. Study abroad on many campuses is an operation of considerable magnitude. Partly because of being separately housed, study abroad programs rarely are identified as part of the profile which ought to be looked at when international studies is scrutinized budgetarily. The same is true of foreign student programs, which may actually represent a substantial income source to the university. Major international research programs, sometimes of multimillion dollar dimensions, in schools such as agriculture, medicine, or engineering can remain entirely beyond the ken of those faculty who have traditionally seen themselves as the campus internationalists.

International studies thus tends to be hidden in profile and to be regarded as possibly superfluous by authorities who make critical budgetary and policy decisions, such as members of boards of regents or budget committees in state legislatures.

Foreign language study can be examined structurally as an aspect of international studies or as a separate sphere in its own right. Traditionally, language departments evolved in much the same way as other departments. The advent of NDEA caused special attention suddenly to be paid to "uncommon" languages, meaning those which had not generally been taught previously in American institutions. Language and Area Centers were the structural vehicle through which these uncommonly taught languages were incorporated into universities. The venture was largely successful, but it also introduced problems as yet unresolved.

Teachers of most uncommonly taught languages have no natural campus home unless they manage to carve out departmental status. Chinese or Japanese teaching faculty, for instance, have occasionally been numerous or powerful enough to do this. Most such faculty eventually find themselves uncomfortably, and often precariously, attached to a department which sees them as liabilities rather than as assets. Arabic may be in the classics department, Yoruba in linguistics, Finnish in romance languages, and Indonesian in anthropology. An uncommonly taught language faculty who do acquire department status may find victory of dubious value, for they now are subject to the same fight for survival afflicting commonly taught languages.

Teachers of French and German feel just as oppressed as teachers of Arabic and Farsi. Administrators generally view language departments as high in cost,

low in benefit, prime candidates therefore for the bugetary ax. The vulnerability of the language teaching sector is exacerbated by the structural fragmentation of language departments. Excluded from NDEA largesse, common language faculty have tended to be resentful, further weakening the common cause and increasing structural vulnerability.

There are exceptions to this dismal picture. International studies in some universities involves real line authority, adequate representation at senior administrative levels, and comprehensive profile across schools and colleges. But the fact remains, as Clark Kerr has stated, "Many colleges and universities...have yet to face the question of whether international programs are integral or peripheral to the educational enterprise."

17) Poor fit of many programs with the needs either of the immediate campus or of the larger population sector from which an institution's students are drawn.

"We have a long list of individuals and a long list of programs--but they always are regarded as low priority," said one program director. A dean at the same institution agreed but noted, "The [University] Council on International Education did address the issue of structural coordination and integration, but the academics rejected everything." One reason for the low priority and for faculty resistance to attempted remedies is a general fear that any organizational and programmatic changes will be manipulated by fiscally preoccupied administrators to the net disadvantage of foreign language and international studies faculty members collectively. The result can be a stasis or bunker mentality which further impedes adjustment of programs to student interests, intellectual trends and market factors. "'Center' status here means that at some time in the past there was outside funding. It does not correlate with student numbers at all." On the huge campus from which these several quotes were drawn the resources for foreign language and international studies are abundant. Lack of administrative leadership, a pervasive faculty complacency and a history of erratic ups and downs in awards from funding programs have combined with cumbrous structural inertia seriously to damage international education.

This story could be repeated with examples from across the country, in each case presenting unique features but always with the problems of structure and programmatic "fit" coming to the fore.

Innovation has been equally difficult on campus and off. Area studies, language and discipline faculty, even though usually located in the same college of a university, have found it difficult to cooperate with one another. Cooperation with faculty in other colleges, such as education (see Weakness No. 22), business or agriculture has been even more difficult, though there has been strong agreement in theory that cooperative programs are badly needed to respond both to student interests and to the larger communities served.

On first impression many campuses visited were rife with innovation. Closer examination often suggested that some of the change was counterproductive. Creation of a deanship in international education, for instance, was not

much of an advance, if the responsibilities were confined essentially to managing student abroad and foreign student programs and to fund raising. Creation of broad majors in international studies, as supposedly more appealing than language and area studies majors, was another example of questionable innovation. Unless great care was exercised to ensure the maintenance of educational substance, the effect was to weaken both the quality of education and the profile of valuable specialist faculty members. Similarly, at the level of advanced research, a number of programs have been established which encourage doctoral students to undertake broadly comparative or global dissertation projects. While no one was heard to oppose this dimension of research, many scholars reported that such programs all too often allow dangerous substitution of superficial learning for the rigors of acquiring advanced language proficiency, area knowledge and "field" experience. At the same time there was wide recognition of the need for: more variety in overseas research programs; more opportunity for a "problem" orientation; more "intermediate" level research, meaning projects in which the American student or faculty member brings with him a specialization of value to the host country, which he can share in exchange for the information he seeks for his personal use; and more group research, especially where multiple disciplinary skills are required and where foreign scholars can work jointly with Americans.

Off-campus innovation in the present discussion refers primarily to arrangements among various autonomous regional institutions. While everyone voices agreement that the specialized resource strengths located unevenly at separate institutions in a population center or easily traversible geographic region ought to be marshalled to fit student needs irrespective of institutional affiliation, the obstacles have proved formidable. Problems include credit transfer, tuition payment, academic calendars, movement of faculty and students, arrangements across state lines. All inter-institutional arrangements cost money or require unpaid extraordinary effort by individual faculty members. The public/private institutional distinction involves its own special set of impediments which have to do typically with legislative constraints, considerations of prestige and disparities in size. Some of the same impediments are involved when there is a gross imbalance among institutions' specialized international resources. "What's in it for us?" is not an uncommon refrain among major centers when overtures of cooperation come from faculty of ill-resourced two year and four year colleges.

It is a fact nonetheless that models of successful off-campus cooperation do exist. A basic weakness has been our failure to publicize them (see Weakness No. 30).

18) Decline in student demand.

No aspect of foreign language and international studies is more difficult to assess than student demand. Convincing data simply are not available, yet the prevailing impression is that demand had decreased seriously and that the problem is related to job markets, university degree requirements, quality of teaching, availability of fellowships and other financial assistance, neo-isolationism, and the quality of student preparation in previous educational experience.

Part of the problem of assessment derives from the fact that current practices both in university systems and in federal programs induce suppliers of data to provide inaccurate information. Many stratagems exist for the inflation of enrollment data, and nearly every foreign language and international studies program director feels forced to resort to them, if he wants to compete effectively in the realm of university politics and grant applications.

The problem of student demand varies dramatically from one university to another and even, in many cases, from one program to another on a single campus. A few tentative observations can be made on the basis of campus visits and many forms of collected data.

First, programs whose leaders have been responsive to the needs of available constituencies, aggressive in cultivating them, and supportive of those faculty members eager to experiment, have usually managed to flourish or at least to retain secure purchase in the university community.

Second, there is little correlation between level of student demand and whether or not a university is an institution traditionally identified as a leader in foreign language and international studies. A number of southern universities, for instance, would now probably place among the national leaders by the measure of student demand.

Third, temporary setbacks in student demand generally have negligible adverse impact in universities which have managed to secure formal sanction for international studies from presidents, boards of regents, or state legislatures.

Fourth, formal structural profile at high levels of university administration helps individual programs immeasurably in their ability to generate and maintain student interest and to enlist participation from diverse schools and colleges.

Fifth, innovative programs at universities in urban environments have exhibited extraordinary ability to stimulate enrollments in foreign language and international studies.

Sixth, universities which make the effort (and spend the money) to research, cultivate and monitor potential regional job markets benefit in the sense both of educating the market and of informing themselves.

19) Insufficient development of, and funding for, "junior level" graduate programs, i.e., M.A.'s and first professional degrees. (See also Weakness No. 5)

Many respondents claimed that graduate students currently advantage themselves more by the acquisition of two M.A. level degrees, one oriented to foreign language and international studies, the other to a professional school (such as business, law or agriculture), than by pursuit of a Ph.D. While the catalogues of most of the institutions visited do now boast joint degree programs, most such programs are as yet embryonic and rely for administration largely upon paper arrangements and upon the "free" counseling services of a few enterprising and conscientious faculty members. The dual and joint degree programs

nonetheless do appear to function better than the single interdisciplinary degree programs in terms of fitting the student with a graduate education believed to be valuable to potential employers.

Equally important is the development in traditional disciplinary programs of foreign language and/or international studies components. Occasionally this takes the form of "internationalizing" the curriculum, which generally means the working of "international content" into existing courses, such as has been recommended for business programs by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business. In practice, success appears to depend heavily on the enthusiasm and insistence of professional school deans.

NDEA Title VI language and area centers have revolved primarily around the production of Ph.D.'s. Many major centers during the 1960's and early '70's in fact joined the trend toward eliminating the M.A. as a normal step toward entry into doctoral programs, believing that it had become superfluous. In some programs the M.S. became a terminal degree, to be awarded only if the student failed to proceed satisfactorily through the "Comprehensive exam" stage of the doctoral curriculum.

Center faculty respondents invariably argued for the maintenance of a strong Ph.D. focus and agreed that the quality of their centers would otherwise suffer. Most faculty also recognized that regeneration and expansion of the M.A. was essential, if the centers were to survive and adequately serve the needs of students in terms of employment opportunities.

20) Poor quality of language teaching. (See also Weakness No. 16)

Two overlapping vicious cycles appear to attach to the teaching of languages in many universities. One involves the character of language departments and their relationship to the institution. The other involves changing fads in non-language departments, in student interest, and in the American educational community as a whole.

A literary and classicist orientation predominates in most language departments and is encouraged in a university system which places a high premium on publication. In tenure decisions on individual faculty members no amount of evidence of good language teaching and the development of materials for same is likely to offset a poor publications record. The plight of language teaching is further encumbered by the common view of non-language-department-faculty, who predominate on college-level tenure review committees, that foreign languages are "tools" rather than subjects of genuine intellectual merit and that language faculty are legitimate in the academic fraternity only to the extent that they exhibit familiar "scholarly" productivity. Many language faculty share this view. Ironically, the increasing rigor of tenure decisions brought on by declining student numbers has helped to erode the quality of language teaching even further.

The other vicious cycle is more complex, for it involves the entire educational system. Student demands for relevance led to the elimination of language requirements in most departments in most universities, which in turn led to elimination of languages in entry requirements. This provided secondary school officials across the nation with an important part of the rationale necessary

to reduce the number of languages taught, the number of years offered and the number of teachers employed. With declining school age populations the pressure to cut out language classes, with their necessarily low teacher-student ratios, proved irresistable. One result at the university level is that more and more students, if they have studied a language at all, have begun it in college. This has led both to depletion of enrollments in advanced level courses and to accentuation of poor teaching quality in the introductory and intermediate courses. When a graduate student who has managed to get through sixteen to eighteen years of education without any exposure to foreign language learning, is forced suddenly to undergo a poorly taught introductory language course, the educational results are felicitous to no one.

Many professional school representatives stated that graduate language requirements had been dropped essentially because of the poor quality of teaching in the language departments. It was not uncommon, however, to find that a professional school, immediately after dropping a language requirement, had turned around and contracted independently for its own language teaching needs. The allegation of poor teaching, it must be added, most often appeared to be a convenient excuse to do what the professional school wanted to do anyway, which was simply to drop the language requirement.

Many faculty in social science and humanities departments were not significantly different from professional school people in their criticism of language departments, although the rationales differed (see Weakness No. 21).

Those language faculty who are genuine exponents and advocates of good language teaching frequently find their efforts crushed by the apparently inexorable force of the two vicious cycles. To break these cycles, many educators argue, will require nothing short of a national conversion experience and some radical surgery. It may be worth noting, nevertheless, that models of good language teaching and of effective language teaching departments do exist in select institutions and are ready to be drawn upon for guidance, if the environment becomes more receptive.

Uncommonly taught languages appear to have fared better than commonly taught languages by the measures both of quality teaching and relative growth. Novelty, student and teacher motivation, funding support, and recognition that the job is tougher are cited as contributing factors. Still, a course enrollment of ten or fifteen students may excite a faculty member, but it does not impress the typical dean.

21) Serious antagonism toward, and denigration of, international studies in several of the major disciplines in which international studies faculty are located.

Social science and humanities departments--especially history, anthropology, linguistics, political science, economics, art history and foreign languages--were the location of international studies before NDEA centers came on the scene and continue to be the primary home of virtually all center faculty. Most of these departments represent a discipline whose core is identified by a corpus of theory around which teaching and research revolve. International studies has fared well when the corpus of theory has remained loose, the special

preserve of no particular segment of the respective field. Unfortunately, during the 1960's in several disciplines important to large numbers of students and faculty with international interests, forces antagonistic to foreign language and area studies came to dominate both the corpus of theory and the principal vehicles, university departments and professional publications, through which scholars must operate.

"[The tendency to denigrate area studies] has proceeded to such a point," states Professor Benjamin I. Schwartz, "that in certain disciplines such as economics and political science an in-depth, many-sided knowledge of the culture and history of particular foreign societies and the mastery of linguistic skills so crucial to such a knowledge has often come to be regarded as a drawback rather than as a crucial asset." The effect has been as devastating to faculty morale as it has been to the number of students who are willing to undertake arduous area studies training. Some of the nation's senior scholars, internationally respected as leaders of the field, have had to spend the final five to ten years of their careers in an atmosphere of thinly veiled hostility, knowing that as soon as they retire their colleagues will use their slots to hire more specialists in voting behavior or econometric analysis. Universities housing major centers have been as subject to this trend as have those housing minor ones or none at all.

22) Resistance of schools and colleges of education to foreign language and and international studies.

Administrators and faculty on every campus visited stated that one of the most important objectives of any new federal initiatives in foreign language and international studies must be to reach the nation's K-12 teachers and that at the universities this meant penetrating the schools and colleges of education. They also despaired of accomplishing this.

Almost without exception academics outside schools of education hold "education teaching" in contempt, and the contempt is reciprocated. The problem far transcends the issue of foreign language and international studies, but it is a basic conflict whose resolution, or lack thereof, will affect endeavors toward cooperative programs.

A typical scenario of conversation developed in visits with education deans and faculty in those few schools exhibiting interest in the subject of foreign language and international studies. First, I would be told proudly of the school's extensive commitment to international education. This commitment included: some courses with multi-cultural content, an exchange relationship with an institution abroad, cooperative ventures with the state's department of education, and an ancillary materials development unit which had produced a number of booklets on the cultures and peoples of other countries for various grade levels. Some of these materials were of high quality and had been prepared in close cooperation with appropriate area specialists. Second, I would inquire about the exposure of the school's own students to foreign language and international studies. Third, I would learn that there was no requirement whatsoever in foreign language and international studies, although students were free, if they could work it into their electives, to take just about anything they wanted.

The absence of requirements was seen by some to be regrettable, but many personnel explained that certification requirements together with overstaffing of language teachers in the public schools were constraints upon student and faculty interest. A further obstacle frequently cited was the low quality of language teaching and the unwillingness of language faculty to create upper-division courses useful to future school teachers.

The pro-anti education school issue aside, it appears to be a fact that few sectors of campus life present a more bleak terrain for foreign language and international studies than schools or colleges of education. They remain the single most important channel through which higher education must work, if future generations of school teachers are to be equipped adequately to educate our children.

23) Resistance to bringing professional schools into the mainstream of international studies.

This problem has been touched upon at several points in this paper. Clearly, a federal program such as the Title XII University Strengthening Grants will have important impact upon schools of agriculture nationally. However, programs of similar magnitude will be necessary, if other categories of professional schools are to be benefited in manners suitable to their very different educational environments.

Traditional international studies centers are at once optimistic and apprehensive about the impending embrace by professional schools. They are worried lest the "applied science," employment-oriented, government-cozy character of professional school people collide with their carefully preserved intellectual and political independence. At present, it is not identified as a serious problem.

24) Inadequate organization of growing topical studies programs.

This problem, not serious, stems from the tendency of faculty, when existing programs appear in jeopardy, to fabricate sexy new arrangements. Food programs need nutritionists as well as political scientists, just as energy programs need engineers as well as sociologists. Many respondents while urging topical studies centers cited instances of flimsy planning and dubious organization of academic resources.

Fellowships

25) Narrowness in fellowship categories, precipitous decline in the amount of fellowship funding, inadequate periods of tenability.

Fellowship problems can be divided into those affecting students and those affecting faculty. In the beginning NDEA Title VI fellowship applications could come from anywhere in the country. The applicant applied separately for entry into specific graduate programs. He carried the fellowship with him. Gradually the system changed. A given number of fellowships was assigned to the university which in turn awarded them. At present a sum of fellowship money is given to a university program which then can exercise some flexibility in allotting specific amounts to recipient students. The number of fellowships

eventually plummeted and many other fellowship programs withered or dried up entirely. Teaching assistantships, in public universities funded by the states, substituted manageably for awhile, and then they too plummeted.

No data exist to support the position, but many observers believe that the result of all this is a system increasingly based on ascriptive entry factors--such as undergraduate institutional affiliation, department and college politics and a measure of independent wealth. To curb this trend, but just as importantly, to encourage students from non-traditional disciplines and from widely dispersed institutions to utilize the centers, a portion of fellowships, in the opinion of many faculty, should again be made portable.

A majority of specialist faculty are now located at universities that do not have centers. Many able students wish to pursue degrees under their tutelage but require periods of time in the better equipped centers to acquire language skills and other knowledge not available in their home instituions. Suitable fellowship assistance is needed toward this end too.

Special fellowship categories are critically needed to induce experienced school teachers to supplement or upgrade their training.

For center Ph.D. students the fellowships need to be longer in tenability and sufficiently flexible in exercise to allow foreign as well as domestic residence and training from whatever sources their mentors feel can best provide it.

Increasing numbers of graduate students finish their doctorates or professional school training before they find it necessary to pursue an area study specialization. Post-doctoral fellowships (such as already exist in many fields) intended to follow shortly upon receipt of degree are needed for such persons.

Faculty at many centers report that foreign scholars now appear to enjoy appreciably more access to the centers than American scholars. All regard the presence of foreign academics as an important asset, but many are alarmed by the inadequacy of fellowship programs to assist American specialists to use their own nation's leading facilities. Specialists at non-center institutions invariably allude to this anomaly as well.

Title VI centers are at present unable adequately to fund their own faculty members' need periodically to travel to their countries of research interest. Nor do they have the budgetary capability to hold appropriate scholarly conferences and to bring far flung specialists together.

26) Inadequate variety of types of "exchange programs" eligible for funding assistance.

Just one example of a sphere in which modest funding could go a long way is in travel assistance for universities which on their own initiative have established substantial institution-to-institution exchange programs with foreign facilities. Many American universities which have established such exchanges and have ingeniously solved most of the related financial problems have found themselves embarrassed when it comes to negligible sums needed to acquit their end of simple travel arrangements.

27) Virtual absence of fellowship programs designed to assist skill maintenance.

Expensively acquired advanced language and area skills languish and deteriorate when they remain in disuse for more than a few years. The problem is serious even in major language and area centers where the rate of skill loss is retarded by the presence of other specialists and native language speakers. For specialists located elsewhere and isolated from appropriate opportunities for skill reinforcement, the problem is acute. Looking forward to a prolonged period when the academic job market for area specialists is expected to be very tight, it is essential to establish fellowhip programs to help assure that existing faculty specialists retain their skills and keep their area knowledge and familiarity up to date.

Information

28) Inadequate federal level programs for the collection and dissemination of information on employment opportunities.

29) Lack of effective networking.

One revelation on almost every campus was the shocking degree of ignorance about what was happening at other institutions and in other programs around the country. Several ends clearly would be well served were program directors and other interested faculty to have periodic contact with counterparts in other institutions. Title VI center directors, for instance, probably should be brought together annually. Their discussions of operational problems would be invaluable not just for the improvement of their own programs but for the edification of relevant government officials as well. Such meetings reciprocally would provide an opportunity for international education personnel from the Department of Education and from other funding agencies to explain policy changes, float ideas about future programmatic developments and present information on new opportunities.

As things now stand, no natural occasion arises when center directors might be expected to run into one another, especially across the lines of global region affiliations.

The projected networking of center directors is but a single example of the kind of communication opportunity which would help university personnel to enhance institutional activity in foreign language and international studies.

30) Lack of a federal body, or other acceptable agency, to act as an information clearinghouse.

The proverbial wheel gets re-invented regularly in foreign language and international studies. Successful innovations currently have no commonly recognized conduit to those who would be an attentive audience. Information about failures would be just as interesting and helpful. Something like a centrally administered newsletter could be a useful initial step.

31) Inattention to the critical need for development of curricular material suitable for various levels of secondary and elementary school education.

Everyone seemed to raise this issue, but few people had well-formed ideas on how to proceed. One suggestion was that progress in networking and in the establishment of a clearinghouse operation could help to bring into contact persons appropriate to the task.

32) Failure to develop educational materials, especially films, suitable for use in major national media.

New Directions*

The primary object in this short exercise will be to set forth in a few pages the major contours of debate which attend the issues of Advanced Training and Research (meaning graduate studies broadly construed). A secondary object will be to suggest a set of principles, whose sense the Commission might recommend should be reflected in federal funding programs in foreign language and international studies generally. The primary task is fraught with peril, for the full richness of contending major programmatic strategies must give way before deliberate oversimplification necessary to meet immediate Commission needs for decisiveness. The exercise includes some reflection of my findings from six weeks of site visits on some forty campuses. These findings lead me strongly to favor the third alternative, Plan C, among the three programs set out below.

For convenience let us label the three contrastive programs Plan A, B and C.

Plan A

The present NDEA, Title VI, Foreign Language and Area Studies Centers have been eminently successful, but a series of depredations extending from the late 60's to the present have severely diminished their magnitude, demoralized their faculty and damaged their student base. These setbacks, exacerbated by a general federal agency international research funding decline of 52%, in constant dollars, and equally broad-front foundation reallocations, constitute a threat both to national interests and to the educational well-being of American citizens.

What is needed is a return budgetarily to the status quo ante, a better focusing of dollars upon major centers for longer award periods, and some adjustment to accommodate the new directions toward topical, problem, policy or trans-national education and research. What this means in more specific

---

*This section is a slightly edited version of what was originally an interim report to the Commission entitled "General Recommendations on Advanced Training and Research," June 1, 1979. Related submissions included: Paget, "Reform in International Studies: Memorandum to the President's Commission," November, 1978 and Paget, "Draft Statement on Advanced Training and Research," July 12, 1979.

terms is re-establishment of the integrity of the mid-60's area studies center model--perhaps now adopted the term, International Resource Center--with somewhere between 25 and 60 such entities funded at about a $32 million (current dollar) annual level in five year competitive cycles. Gradually meshing into this system would be the new directions enterprises--which might fit under the same rubric, International Resource Centers, and perhaps also encompass some of the existing professional schools of international studies. The total number of IRC's thus might eventually be as high as 90 to 100. To re-establish the 1960's level of funding would require correctives for inflational attrition assumption of that funding component formerly shouldered by foundations, and gradual expansion of the federal-other support ration from 1-9 toward a 2 or 3 to 7 or 8 level.

At the low-end scale of Plan A there would be 25 Area Studies Centers and perhaps 10 new directions centers as opposed to the high-end range of 60-70 of the former and 30 of the latter. Either way, the total money would remain the same. Under the first scheme the nation could expect the further emergence of a highly select group of handsomely serviced research training facilities. Political exigency, not educational considerations, could force the fall-back scheme, which would entail the much larger number of institutions and hence the further fractioning of the given pool of money.

Under Plan A each of the IRC's would enjoy a panoply of allocational spheres, covering cost areas from clerical staff to library support to graduate fellowships to curricular development activity. Each center would operate essentially the way current centers do, except that funding duration would be longer and freedom and incentives for comprehensive activity would be appreciably greater.

The immediate FY 1981 funding package request under Plan A would be somewhere between $25 and $45 million dollars (the range reflecting varying mixtures vis-à-vis center operation budgets, fellowship pools, library support, etc.). Scale is difficult to convey here. In terms of the magnitude of international studies within the overall budget of the Department of Education, Plan A would offer miniscule advance from the present 2/100 of 1% perhaps to a high of 4/100 of 1%. Measured against the late 60's combined federal and foundation support, and adjusted for inflation, the nominal dollar advance of Plan A actually becomes a net retreat.

Plan B

The present NDEA, Title VI, Foreign Language and Area Studies Centers have been eminently successful, in part because of the very high proportion of support which has been generated by the recipient institutions themselves from state and local, alumnae and commercial, and other, sources. These centers must be maintained at the high quality of performance they have demonstrated in the past.

Prevailing winds of budgetary curtailment as well as the dictates of good educational principle advise a certain course of action in assistance of advanced training and research. Ideally, we may be able to stave off or retard the rate of withdrawal of tax dollars for international studies. But whatever sum we get, its distribution should be governed by hewing to American citizens' strongest virtues, such as individual intitiative and fee market competiveness.

Major area studies centers have gotten where they are because of individual effort. The high quality of their faculty offers virtual guarantee that in any form of competition these major centers, especially important in terms of our national security, will continue to preserve their prominence on the landscape of international studies.

But even at the major centers a diet too high in federal gravy would induce sloth and waste. Eager faculty at each of the 2500 institutions of higher education in the U.S. should feel their institutions will have a chance in competing for federal programming support for foreign language and international studies.

What is needed is a decrease in the size of grants to major centers, a substantial expansion in the number of institutional grants given, and a reduction in grant periods to one or two years. It would be necessary to differentiate modestly between the 100 IRC's on the one hand and the lesser 200 Regional Resource Programs on the other, but a general leveling of funding and heightened egalitarian access would be central features of Plan B.

The top hundred centers would receive an average of $140,000 each; the lesser two hundred, $50,000 each-for a total sum of $24 million. Again, scale is difficult to render. The sum can be argued equally well as a 300% increase, a 50% increase, a 50% decrease or a 100% decrease. On the larger screen of OE budgets or foreign affairs budgets it remains nearly invisible. On a DOD scale $24 million is less than the 1980 cost of a single fully equipped fighter plane.

Plan C

NDEA Title VI Centers, especially the 25 or so major centers among them, have fulfilled splendidly the Ford/NDEA mandate which centrally influenced their development. That mandate was to cultivate training and research capabilities of the most advanced level, and critical, or uncommon, or non-traditional spheres of language and area studies were explicitly favored. The emphasis was on high level, high quality, relatively esoteric, and geographically selective, activity.

Commission members occasionally cite the Charter concern "to extend the knowledge of other civilizations to the broadest population base possible..." In the sphere of Advanced Training and Research we have therefore two contradictory objectives. Precepts governing the operation of the major existing area studies centers clearly favor quality, narrow focus and selectivity. The broad population base in graduate studies lies neither among those elite institutions where major area studies/international studies centers generally are located nor at the doctoral level which has had the bulk of attention in area studies training. If one seeks to have any measurable quantitative impact across the realm of graduate studies in the U.S., one must deal with state universities and land grant institutions and with the "junior" level of graduate studies--terminal or thesis MA programs, professional school programs and perhaps Carnegie-style teaching doctorate programs.

Failure to attune funding programs to the needs of the major available constituency would seem to be unwise, both in terms of educational wisdom and

the Commission's mandate. Examination of institutions across the country reveals rich local environments, usually uniquely well attuned to the educational modalities of a state, or sub-state, region. Even where one finds on a particular campus no formal international studies infrastructure, the number of individual specialists can number many dozen and the variety of internationalist activities already in place can be impressive. In some of these large institutions, cooperation among professional schools or between professional schools and liberal arts and sciences is well in advance of the major area study institutions.

What is needed is a conceptual premise that addresses forthrightly the quite different functions that need to be performed in order to reach graduate population clusters across the country. More specifically, we need to recognize for major funding purposes three kinds of institutions. (The distinctions are of function, not quality.) These are National Resource Centers, Regional Resource Centers, and International Studies Programs.

1) National Resource Centers

Twenty to twenty-five National Resource Centers would be chosen, principally according to magnitude and quality of research holdings on one or more global regions, and, very secondarily, according to suitability of physical plant and domestic geographic distribution. In return for semi-permanent (preferably on a twenty-year, but no less than on a ten-year, cycle) federal support for a research collection's healthy maintenance and growth, the academic institution would have to commit itself contractually to certain national obligations.

Names would not change (Cornell's Southeast Asia Program would still be called just that), but as a National Resource Center on a particular global region, the quid pro quo would be maximum accessibility for all interested citizens.

Full use of summers would be a first priority. Intensive language instuction (at home and abroad); country and topical classes and seminars; research and teaching opportunities; extra- or para-professional school training programs; elementary and secondary school, junior college and community college curricular materials development--these are a few of the spheres in which the major centers can be used more fruitfully in summers. Most of these advances in the use of existing major facilities require federal support, but the obvious advantages to sender and recipient institutions are such that the federal government should require the financial burden to be substantially shared by the institutions and the individuals served.

A basic concept here is that the National Resource Center becomes a venue as much as it is an educational enterprise in its own right. Teacher organizations, SSRC/ACLS joint committees, area studies associations and perhaps other organizations could play important roles in mediation, monitoring and organizing these activities, especially where handling fellowship/scholarship/travel fund dimensions.

In different ways these same centers should be used for semester and academic-year-long activity supplementary to or integrated with existing educational programs.

The traditional central stengths of the major centers must be maintained. The substantial library support will help but not suffice. The expansion of venue use and library use will help, but again, will not suffice. A number of mechanisms of assistance specially focused on the major centers--mechanisms such as have been discussed in Ford Foundation and SSRC documents--need to be maintained. Not the least of these mechanisms is support for preparation and publication of materials relative to the study of uncommon languages.

Gradually, it may be advisable to include topical centers among the National Resource Centers. Also, there may be one or two of the professional schools of international studies which, again depending on magnitude of research collections, should be included.

2) Regional Resource Centers.

This category includes the bulk of institutions where Title VI Centers are presently located. At the height of Title VI history there were some 106 centers. Three quarters of them to varying degrees always have suffered precarious existence, rarely sure from year to year whose ax might fall from where. Exorbitant effort, often measurable as net loss from useful educational activity, has gone into the fight for survival.

Yet these centers offer an infra-structure, already in place, upon which to build in many institutions. A basic problem has been the model (and those employing it) against which these centers get measured. Criteria for evaluation of grant applications and renewals, as well as the application of these criteria, reflect very strong negative sanction for deviation from the models represented by the major centers. Were these smaller or less well known centers weighed in terms of feasible tasks appropriate to their own institutional and geographic environment, the importance of their activity would be more visible both to their own institutional administrators and to outside evaluators.

These Regional Resource Centers can also immediately include some of the professional international studies programs and a number of topical studies enterprises.

Cooperative programs with professional schools, outreach programs, in-service and curricular development in cooperation with state DOE's and local districts, consortia programs with other tertiary institutions--would feature more prominently in evaluations of Regional Resource Center performance.

3) International Studies Programs.

In terms of the objective of having impact on a maximum number of citizens the International Studies Programs would be at the high end of the scale of importance. Population clusters would be a major criterion for allocations here. The separation of graduate and undergraduate clienteles, however, would be treated deliberately as indistinct. It would seem especially advisable to stimulate those innovative programs which lend some formal recognition to students who undertake blocks of foreign language and other international studies training. Such programs, occasionally called "certificate" programs, may extend slightly beyond the conventional four year BA curriculum or, conversely, reach below the conventional MA/MS curriculum to allow credit at a graduate level for some portion of undergraduate work.

The 250-300 grants in this functional category would range in modest size from $20,000 to $80,000, average $40,000, and cover 1-3 year periods depending on the nature of the activity. The size of the institution, the size of the local population, and the size of the group to be most directly involved would be explicitly recognized as significant, though not determinative, criteria. A small pool of grants would be reserved for programs at small, high quality institutions clearly not eligible for the other two functional programs. Similarly, another modest pool would be reserved for experimental programs directly attached to professional schools.

* * * * *

Under Plan C costs would rise to a level approximately four times present funding in basic structures plus another twenty million dollars in library supports and fifteen million dollars in certain fellowship areas for a total of perhaps $100,000,000. Some of the costs could be deflected or disguised by distribution of some component tasks among several agencies. ICA surely would be a major candidate. But an assumption beneath Plan C is that the substantial increment in expenditure will be more than compensated by the several hundred fold escalation in the institutional populations served and the several thousand fold expansion in citizens affected.

PRO'S and CON'S

Plan A - Advantages:

1) Addresses quite directly the desperate plight of many existing area studies centers.

2) Maintains continuity and continues the relative homogeneity of Title VI programs.

3) Involves negligible, if any, increments in constant dollar funding.

4) Allows for modest change to accommodate new directions.

- Disadvantages:

1) Neglects almost entirely junior levels of graduate study.

2) Ignores problems of geographic and demographic distribution.

3) Fails to connect the Advanced Training and Research sector with other educational levels.

4) Perpetuates the elitist nature of area studies centers.

Plan B - Advantages:

1) Maintains programmatic continuity.

2) Expands appreciably the number of institutions involved in Title VI activity, though at nominal additional cost.

3) May foster a more equitable competition base by its zero-based planning mode.

4) Encourages geographic movement of funding activity and hence may reach more citizens.

- Disadvantages:

1) Escalates numbers of bureaucrats and levels of paperwork.

2) Further impedes the process of educational planning in individual institutions.

3) Encourages entrepreneurship of the opportunistic sort among faculty at institutions with dubious commitment to international studies.

4) Neglects the opportunities of relationships involving professional schools.

Plan C - Advantages:

1) Projects formal profile for the graduate study of international studies into every state and most major population centers and populous universities thereof.

2) Addresses the primary need to expand the junior level graduate studies base.

3) Exploits more fully currently dispersed specialists and existing major and minor centers.

4) Recognizes the strengths of local educational environments and needs.

- Disadvantages:

1) Is costly to fund and it may be difficult to administer.

2) Does not confront the problem of finding careers in foreign language and international studies.

3) Gives too much security to a few major centers, and interferes in the autonomy of academic institutions.

4) Acknowledges inadequately the educational leadership of existing major area studies centers.

PRINCIPLES

A number of thoughtful individuals across the country have voiced the view that the Commission would provide an important service simply by enunciating a list of recommended principles, to be followed whatever the eventual program contours and/or agency location(s).

Such principles might include the following:

1) Federal assistance in foreign language and international studies should operate deliberately in a countercyclical mode.

2) Institutions expecting to participate in major funding programs should be required to provide stronger evidence of long range commitment than has been required in the past.

3) To the extent that multiple funding programs emerge, special attention should be given to avoiding the "super market" syndrome; institutions should be rewarded for coherent programming.

4) Models of institutional programs that work should be publicized and widely disseminated.

5) Outreach is as much needed on campus as off campus.

6) Paperwork should be sharply curtailed (Centers should not think it necessary to submit applications thicker than two New York telephone directories.)

7) In recognition of the need to respect and cultivate academic diversity, maximum freedom of budgetary manuever (within the constraints of overall budget) should be available to Center directors.

8) Multiple interests should be represented in major policy determinations, so as to reduce or eliminate erratic or capricious policy changes.

9) Grant and fellowship selection and review processes should favor particular kinds of institutions or individuals only when formal policy exists which clearly specifies the target(s) and rationales for such action.

STATEMENT ON ADVANCED TRAINING AND RESEARCH IN INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Robert E. Ward
Commission Member

I What is Meant by Advanced Training and Research in International Studies?

The phrase "advanced training and research in international studies"* requires some explanation. It embraces several different kinds of activities.

"Advanced training" in this field is of two general types. The first is postgraduate or postdoctoral training that focuses on one or several foreign societies or cultures. While encouraging specialization in some particular aspects of the society or societies concerned such as the economy, politics, literature, or art, this so-called "area approach" does so within a context of strong interdisciplinary emphasis on mastery of the language, broad knowledge of the culture in general, and extended residence in the country or countries involved. The result of such training is an "area specialist."

The second type of "advanced training" focuses on public or private interrelationships and interactions across national borders without primary reference to a particular foreign society or area. Examples would be postgraduate or postdoctoral training in international relations, international law or business, foreign trade, comparative politics, or major international problems such as economic development, food, population, energy, or arms control. The product of such training we will call a "transnational specialist."

Some see these two approaches--the area and transnational--as competitive and hostile. A more accurate and constructive view would be that they are complementary and equally essential. In fact, the academic barriers that have in the past usually separated area from transnational training are now more frequently being surmounted. This results either from programs that include in their training requirements substantial elements of both approaches or from the structuring of team research projects in such a manner that they include both area and transnational specialists who focus their skills on the solution of a common problem. These are developments of high potential value to the national interest that can be encouraged through a policy of locating programs of advanced area and transnational training and research on the same or neighboring campuses whenever possible.

"Advanced research" in international studies is defined as the systematic record of the findings of such area and transnational specialists in their fields of specialization and the investigative procedures that lead to those findings.

*International studies in this sense is defined as systematic training or research focussed primarily on foreign societies or cultures or on interactions and interrelationships among governments, groups, and people across national boundaries.

II What National Interests are Served by Advanced Training and Research in International Studies?

The basic proposition involved was well stated by Sylvia Porter when she wrote: Whatever the shape of tomorrow's world, you can be sure that it will be increasingly international." Barring a global return to barbarism as a result of nuclear warfare or environmental catastrophe and given the technological accomplishments and economic, political, and social needs and desires of modern societies, it is difficult to dissent from the force of her argument. The enormous and steadily increasing importance of international problems and international opportunities to the security and well-being of the American people has already been demonstrated in some detail in the Introduction to this Report. Against this background it is obviously in the best interests of the United States to deal with both our international problems and opportunities from a vantage point of as extensive and reliable knowledge about the foreign governments, peoples, economies, and cultures concerned as our national resources and other priorities permit. Despite this, however, the present trend of educational developments in the United States is adverse to the acquisition of the knowledge and skills about foreign societies, languages, and cultures that our collective interests clearly require--in other words our educational and research systems are seriously and increasingly out of synchronization with our national interests.

More specifically, what are the national interests involved and how are they related to advanced training and research in international studies?

1. National Security: There can be no doubt that American influence upon the policies and behavior of foreign governments as well as our margins of military superiority have decreased dramatically since the 1950s. There are numerous and worrisome grounds for assuming that these adverse trends may well continue. While some part of this decline in the preponderance of American power and influence abroad is attributable to an inevitable resurgence of the resources and power of competing states from abnormally low postwar circumstances, a substantial residue is due to other causes, some of which should be curable.

These other causes are numerous and complexly interrelated. The Commission in this section of its report is addressing only a portion of them. It makes no claim that rectifying the deficiencies it sees in these particular areas would necessarily result in speedy or spectacular improvements in our national security. It is convinced, however, that changes along the lines it recommends would result in a significant increase in the capacity of the United States to deal effectively with its security problems and, thereby, improve the odds on our in fact being able to do so.

The security-related deficiencies we have in mind are the following. The country obviously lacks linguistic and analytic skills and expertise with respect to certain foreign areas. Recent examples would include Iran, Yemen, Angola, or Ethiopia. These particular illustrations have meaning and force largely because we have recently experienced setbacks in all of them and because in each instance it was clearly the case that we were

either unprepared or ill-prepared in terms of local knowledge or competence to deal effectively with the problems involved. Unfortunately, there is nothing unusual about these cases in either current or retrospective terms. They exist today vis-a-vis a number of other potentially explosive countries and areas. Retrospectively, they have been typical of every major war in which the United States has been involved since 1941. Where Japan, Korea, and Viet-Nam successively were concerned, the United States was equally and almost totally unprepared in terms of an even remotely adequate national stock of linguistic and analytic skills and competence. As a result we had to improvise hastily, expensively, and not very effectively. By any standard the costs of this persistent unpreparedness were high.

Similar circumstances prevail where a second matter is concerned. National security today is far more than a military and strategic problem. It has important and pervasive economic, financial, scientific, technological, demographic and resource dimensions as well. Academically speaking, the ways in which such matters relate to national security and international politics is in most cases a fairly recent subject of study. As a result the country lacks an adequate stock of well-trained specialists in the international aspects of the sea, etc. Given the rapidly increasing scale and importance of our interactions with other states in such areas, it is clearly in the national interest to make certain that we acquire a better supply of such competencies.

It is not sufficient, however, simply to create an adequate national supply of well-trained area and transnational specialists. One must also provide for the effective use of their costly and valuable skills. It is quite possible that the country is worse off in this respect than it is where our national stock of area and transnational specialists is concerned. We have through such means as the Fulbright Program and Title VI of the National Defense Education Act actually made a great deal of very impressive progress in the production of area specialists. Although serious deficiencies exist, the United States is far better off today in this respect than it was prior to 1958. But we continue to lack either the will or the means to use these skills efficiently in the service of national goals either within or outside of the federal government.

Inside the federal government there are a substantial number of well-trained area and transnational specialists. But the nature of federal service is such that it values "generalists" more highly than "specialists." As a result identification as a specialist is widely regarded as a career handicap, the recruitment of top-flight specialists is handicapped, the advancement of those already in the service suffers, and few specialists achieve positions of sufficient authority to make their views heard where the determination of policy is concerned.*

* See the Rand Corporation study done for the Commission by Berryman, Langer, Pincus, and Solomon entitled Foreign Language and International Studies: the Marketplace and National Needs (1979), Chapter IV.

The efficacy of specialists within the government is further qualified by a widespread failure to make systematic provision for the updating of their knowledge or for occasional assignments abroad to renew and revise their knowledge of their country or subject of specialization. The operating assumption seems to be: "Once an expert, always an expert." Given the rapidly changing circumstances of the areas and fields of specialization involved, this is obviously not the case. Such knowledge requires periodic updating.

These shortcomings where the use of specialists within the government are concerned could in some degree be offset and the national interests as a whole could be far better served if there existed some more systematic and efficient means of identifying and making use of skills and resources located outside the government in academic, business, or labor circles. Again, present circumstances are not encouraging. In constant 1967 dollars, for example, the expenditures of federal agencies for university-based foreign affairs research declined from $20.3 million in 1967 to $8.5 million in 1976-77. It is the Commission's belief that the scale and complexity that characterize the security and international problems of the United States today are such as to require that the government have regular access to the expertise and advice of external specialists and considerably greater interest and skill in making effective use of these external resources than is presently the case. This is not apt to develop spontaneously.

Finally the Commission believes that the government is not making effective use of its research capacities with respect to security-related international issues. The conditions it finds in this respect may best be summed up in a quotation from the above-noted Rand Corporation report:

> [A senior intelligence official] asserted that the intelligence community is bankrupt in its development of a national data base on foreign countries. An overwhelming emphasis on current intelligence reporting reinforces the tendency to formulate foreign and national security policies in a highly reactive manner. One official commented that policy unbounded by a long-term perspective skates across current events without being able to track long-term trends. Virtually all officials noted that the U.S. Government lacks an institutional commitment to long-term analysis of specific problem areas. One senior Defense Department official asserted that we are drawing down our manpower base for foreign intelligence assessment, and we are not making a national investment in basic analysis. There is a minimal intelligence effort on Third World Countries and we are not developing basic sources of information on potentially important foreign areas. The lead times for intellectual results are quite long, and the government is under-investing in analytical work relative to its collection of basic information."

The Commission's investigations have convinced it that these four conditions--an inadequate supply of area and transnational specialists in some areas and subject matters, the inefficient use of area and transnational specialists within the government, the lack of any effective interagency mechanism for assessing federal needs and identifying and making use of area

and transnational skills and resources located outside the government, and the inefficient use of national research capacities--exist in serious degree and cannot help but have an adverse effect upon the formulation and execution of our national security policies. We will offer recommendations calculated to improve our circumstances in all of these respects.

2. Democratic Process in the Foreign Policy Field: The postwar years have brought about profound changes in the ways in which foreign policy is made and carried out in the United States. Foreign policies are now formulated and administered in ways that are not notably different from those applying to domestic policies. Practically as much attention is paid to their domestic consequences and to popular reactions at home as to the effects of such policies abroad. Whatever one's view of the issues involved, it would be difficult to deny the great, if not controlling, importance of public opinion with respect to such current international problems as energy or SALT II. Under these circumstances the extent and sophistication of popular knowledge about foreign affairs is of far greater significance than was the case when such matters were of only occasional, and usually minor, importance to the national well-being and congressional and public attention to foreign affairs was, therefore, normally small.

The Commission fully appreciates the problems involved in any endeavor to raise the general level of popular knowledge about foreign affairs. It is convinced, however, that a serious effort to do so must be made and that, when this is done, the success of the endeavor will in significant part depend upon the quality and attractiveness of the instructional materials available to our schools and adult educational institutions. We are, therefore, offering recommendations calculated to maximize the contributions of our centers of advanced training and research--where ultimately much of the relevant knowledge and information originates--to the advancement of international studies at other educational levels.

Similarly, it is a matter of increasingly major consequence that there be independent and highly competent sources of information about foreign affairs readily available to the congress, the media, and the American people. The democratic process would be seriously endangered if any of these elements were to become largely or totally dependent upon governmental sources for such information. The country needs sources of divergent views and policy alternatives that are not subject to official control or influence. The Commission believes that its recommendations are well calculated to achieve marked improvements in our national circumstances in this respect as well.

3. A Prosperous Economy: Our economy has become increasingly dependent upon and interactive with foreign economies, sources of supply, and markets. The scale of these interactions has become very large and critically important to the prosperity and well-being of the American people. Obviously the country has serious problems with its foreign economic policies and relations in both the public and private senses. Some are specific such as exchange rates, energy supplies, and our persistently adverse trade balance. Others are more general and even more basic. The international circumstances of the American economy are in some respects disturbingly similar to those already described in the field of national security. The margins of scientific,

technological, managerial, and entrepreneurial advantage that the United States enjoyed over its principal competitors in the 1950s and '60s are inexorably diminishing. Few fields remain where American leadership is not subject to mounting and worrisome challenges from abroad. For example, the dollar value of German, Japanese, and French exports, once far lower, in 1978 almost equalled that of the United States and was growing at a much more rapid rate. While our circumstances are not yet desperate, it would be prudent in both the public and private interests if we were to reflect seriously on our existing capacity to operate effectively in what is certain to be a far more competitive international economic environment in the future. There is a disturbing lack of either foresight or practical concern on this score in both public and private quarters.

The more basic issues involved in the maintenance of a prosperous American economy transcend the mandate of this Commission. Our investigations do, however, reveal particular areas where our recommendation should be of help to this cause. First and most basically, the Rand study makes clear the fact that American international business interests would like to see, and feel that in a general recuriting sense they would benefit from, a more cosmopolitan system of education that would produce Americans who are more knowledgeable and more sophisticated about foreign languages and cultures. Second, while the Rand report makes quite clear the fact that American international business in general ranks foreign language and area skills only fifth or sixth on its list of qualifications sought in hiring new employees, there are a number of notable exceptions to this rule. For example, American corporate executives actually serving abroad rate local language and area skills more highly than do their superiors serving in the home office. Again, business operations in certain world areas such as Latin America, the Francophone sections of Africa, or parts of Southeast Asia benefit appreciably from a knowledge of the local language and culture. It is also the case that particular businesses that involve close and direct personal relations with clients, e.g. management consulting, international law, foreign correspondence, overseas banking, airlines, hotels, and tourism, place a high premium on the recruitment of individuals with relevant linguistic and cultural skills. It is also clear that American business has what might be described as episodic needs for particular language and area capacities. When a sizeable new market such as Mainland China is opening, for example, such skills are apt to command a premium. In other circumstances there may be a strong demand for particular languages that are in short supply, e.g. Chinese, Korean, Farsi, Arabic, or Japanese.

In most other cases, however, American business regards such language and area competencies as a useful and desirable ancillary qualification. Their principal interest is in the professional or technical business qualifications and promise possessed by job applicants. Where the major industrial multinational firms are concerned, their quite uniform policy is to indigenize their overseas offices at the earliest possible moment and thus meet their needs for local linguistic, political, economic, and cultural knowledge by operating through well-trained and competent nationals of that particular foreign area. If one is not concerned about the possible long-term consequences of such policies upon the ultimate well-being of the American economy or about the potential responsiveness of such truly

internationalized firms to the requirements of American national policies and interests, especially in time of war or worldwide economic stress or recession, this system appears to meet the needs of the multinationals quite effectively.

The Commission's recommendations, insofar as they relate to the maintenance of a prosperous American economy, strive to take the complexities of the preceding circumstances into account by arguing for the maintenance of our national capacities for the production of well-trained language and area specialists subject to controls calculated to achieve a better adjustment between supply and demand and a better targeting of types and levels of training with respect to particular sorts of demand.

4. Efficient Use of National Resources: The Commission is aware and very much concerned about the need that its recommendations keep constantly in mind the efficient and economical use of national and other public resources. The issues that arise are complex and require some explanation.

First, since we are dealing essentially with educational matters, our subject is traditionally and primarily a matter for state and local control and support. Despite this basic doctrine, it has long been recognized that certain aspects of education are vested with a strong national interest that makes federal encouragement and supplementary support either necessary or desirable, e.g. agriculture, science, minorities, impacted communities. The Commission believes this to be clearly and urgently the case where foreign language and international studies are concerned. Foreign affairs and relations are constitutionally a primary responsibility of the federal government. The benefits derived from international education clearly redound more to the federal than to state or local advantage. And, given the historic neglect of this type of study by local educational systems, it requires some federal stimulus and guidance if we are to obtain the sort of results that the national interest demands.

Against this background, however, the Commission believes that basic control of the educational programs involved should remain at the local level. Fortunately, the financial circumstances are such as to insure that this will be the case. A recent study by the U.S. Office of Education demonstrates that on the average only about nine percent of the support for eighty existing centers of area and language instruction comes from the federal government. The Commission's recommendations will not seriously increase that degree of federal dependence but are, on the contrary, calculated to insure that the great bulk of the financial support involved will continue to come from local public or private sources. The recommendations involved would cost little more than the presently authorized ceiling of $75,000,000 for Title VI of the National Defense Education Act, and they would also provide that increases over actual present appropriations be phased in gradually over a period of three or four years beginning in FY'81.

The Commission has also been very much concerned with questions of manpower supply and demand in the international studies field. It was for this reason that we commissioned the above-cited report on Foreign Language and International Studies: the Marketplace and National Need by the

Rand Corporation. The report's findings clearly indicate several items of importance. First, with significant federal assistance, we have made very impressive advances in the field of language and international studies. Speaking only of facilities for advanced training and research, the country now has a fair number of outstanding programs in both the area and transnational fields that are doing an excellent job of producing both well-trained specialists at the masters and doctoral levels and advanced research in fields of great national interest.

Second, the report detects certain imbalances, inadequacies, and structural needs in the field that require attention. There is no doubt, for example, given normal peacetime demands, that programs are having difficulties placing their Ph.Ds in suitable academic, business, or governmental positions. The demand for appropriately trained M.A.s is somewhat better. Under these circumstances the efficient use of national resources argues for some decrease in federal subsidies for the production of specialists in overstocked disciplines and areas, the diversion of resources to the production of specialists in underpopulated but needful areas and subjects, and the creation of a means that will make possible periodic measurements of public and private needs for specialists in the international field and the adjustment of federal support accordingly. In doing so, however, it is important to recognize, first, that there will be a substantial continuing demand for replacements in the so-called surplus specializations* which merits federal assistance on national interest grounds and, second, that in times of crises rather than normality these alledgedly surplus skills might be of extraordinary national value. What is needed, therefore, is a rational means of population control and adjustment, not a cessation of federal support.

The Rand Report also recommends a positive federal effort to encourage improved performance or new developments along lines that would result in a more efficient use of national resources, e.g. more effective instruction in the spoken aspects of foreign languages especially in such contexts as business, diplomacy, and the professions where such competence would be most useful; federal support for certain national facilities such as the inter-university programs for advanced language training in Tokyo, Taipei, New Delhi, and Cairo, the International Research and Exchanges Board that manages our exchange programs with the U.S.S.R. and seven East European states in the Soviet Bloc; or the joint area and international committees of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council that stimulate, monitor, and administer on a national and international scale some of our most important research undertakings in the international field.

Finally, the Commission believes that there are serious organizational and administrative problems with respect to the existing federal provisions for the support of international studies programs that detract from the efficient use of national resources. For example, the position and status

* See, for example, Table 10 in the appendices to the recent Ford Foundation study by Elinor G. Barber and Warren Ilchman entitled International Studies Review (May 1979).

of the Division of International Education within both the U.S. Office of Education hierarchy and that of HEW is decidedly marginal. As a result the Division lacks both the access and the influence necessary to play an effective role in those aspects of intradepartmental policymaking that relate to international matters. Even more important, however, is the failure of the executive branch to organize itself effectively for dealing with the increasingly critical problems of how best to recruit the outstanding talents so badly needed in the international field and how best to obtain the enormous variety of information, analysis, and advice that is needed if we are to have a sound basis for our international policies in the political, strategic, economic, technological and other fields.

This failure has at least two major dimensions. One relates to the sectarian proclivities that make interagency cooperation so difficult within the executive community. Foreign affairs today are so complex and so far ramifying that they have become an important part of the official missions of most major federal departments and agencies. Consequently, all such agencies share a need for competent personnel and an adequate data base, i.e. research findings, where their international responsibilities are concerned. This should suggest the advisability of creating some interagency mechanism for considering their common problems in the international field including the nature and satisfactoriness of overall federal relationships with the academic programs that provide most of their recruits and a great deal of the data base on which their in-house international research is founded. Yet no effective interagency mechanism of this sort exists.

A second major organizational shortcoming of the executive branch with respect to international studies is the absence of any effective means of routinely enlisting outside help in the international field. External research programs based usually on government-academic contracts represent one approach to the problem. But this is a clumsy, fragmentary, and inefficient approach to a much more complicated matter. Our problems of foreign policy today are so complex as to exceed by far the competence of any in-house research staff. This is particularly the case where in-depth analysis or research that goes beyond the reportage of current developments to an endeavor to provide historical or comparative context and the identification of continuing or emerging trends is concerned. Much of the inadequacy of the research basis for our national foreign policy may well be due to the almost complete fixation of our research and policy determining agencies on what might be called spot research or, better yet, sheer reporting of highly contemporary developments in terms that lack a great deal in terms of analysis, context, or trends over time. Given the incessant daily pressures to which operating officials and research staffs within the government are subject, it seems doubtful that this problem can be resolved on an in-house basis. This suggests to the Commission the desirability of somehow institutionalizing the relationships between the international agencies of the federal government on the one hand and the enormous resources of talents, skills, and knowledge to be found in academic, business, and labor circles on the other. The goal should be to achieve for government more routine, more extensive, and more useful access to external resources in the international field than it now enjoys and, hopefully, thereby to create opportunities for the gradual emergence of friendlier and more mutually supportive relationships and greater understanding among the parties involved. Such a development would in the Commission's judgement

contribute substantially to the more efficient use of national resources and we will later present recommendations to this effect.

5. Cultural Enrichment: The national interests of a democratic society should embrace more than primarily utilitarian considerations such as prosperity, security, and the efficient use of national resources. They should also include the cultural values and potentialities for the enrichment of individual lives and careers implicit in an educational system that provides knowledge and appreciation of cultures, languages, and societies other than our own. This is particularly true of a nation such as the United States whose basic traditions and circumstances have normally been such as to foster either isolationist or narrowly Eurocentric attitudes and orientations among its people. For many a knowledge of foreign languages, literatures, and cultures is in its own right a deeply rewarding and fulfilling experience. One should not overlook in this connection the special importance that such knowledge can have for our minority populations as well as for other Americans in understanding the different backgrounds and perspectives that these minorities bring to life in the United States. Such learning is also one of the best ways to acquire a sense of perspective and appreciation for one's own society and culture. The Commission's recommendations will take these cultural and educational needs into account.

III The Unique Role of Advanced Training and Research

The United States has an important interest in many aspects of the general field of International Studies. The effective teaching of foreign languages or the provision of reasonable amounts of well-designed instruction in international subjects at the primary, secondary, undergraduate, or adult educational levels would be examples. All are of great and increasing national consequence. But, ultimately, all of these depend upon our country's capacity to generate or make available in English the knowledge about other languages, societies, and peoples that is the basic subject matter of international education at all levels and in all contexts. It is the peculiar and irreplaceable function of advanced training and research programs in international studies to produce the area and transnational specialists and professionals who in turn produce, interpret, organize, analyze, and transmit most of the fundamental knowledge about international matters upon which all other educational activities in the international field depend. This is a unique and essential function. The better it is performed, the greater the odds that international education at other levels will also be realistic and effective and, ultimately, the better the chances that the United States will be able to conduct effectively its public and private affairs abroad.

IV What Needs to be Done to Insure an Adequate Advanced Training and Research Capacity for the United States?

In answering this question, certain premises should first be made clear:

-- The Commission does not want to endanger in any way the baisc principle of local control of education. Neither do we believe that our recommendations, if accepted, would result in such a change. The degrees of federal financial involvement and potential leverage are too small--about nine percent at present--and not substantially more prospectively.

--- The Commission believes that the federal government has a legitimate and important interest in the survival and health of this country's programs of advanced training and research in international studies. The area concerned is legally and traditionally one of primary federal rights. The general national interest involved is the country's capacity to deal effectively and intelligently with the ever-increasing portion of the national agenda that involved our public and private relations and activities beyond our borders. The benefits involved redound largely to the advantage of the federal government, not the states or localities.

--- The Commission recognizes that, as a result of joint private and public initiatives at both the local and national levels since World War II, the United States has acquired a very impressive array of advanced training and research programs in the international field. The basic purposes of these programs were to provide the country with a corps of academic specialists well trained in the languages and cultures of a broad range of largely non-Western societies that had long been neglected or ignored by the American educational system and with a fund of knowledge about these societies that would be useful for both scholarly and public purposes. In general these purposes have been well served and the programs richly merit commendation on these scores. Against this background the Commission's present concern is twofold: first, how best to preserve the health and well-being of our existing national resources for advanced training and research in the international field and, second, how best to build upon these existing resources and, where necessary, design new ones to meet national needs that have arisen more recently or were not fully perceived at the time of the earlier federal legislation in this field.

--- The Commission is convinced that there have been a series of adverse developments that seriously threaten the effectiveness, or sometimes even the existence, of advanced training and research programs in the international field. Involved has been a disastrous conjunction in the past few years of drastic declines in university incomes and budgets generally, a drop of more than fifty percent in constant dollars of federal funding under Title VI of the National Defense Education Act, an almost total withdrawal of the foundation support long of major importance to these programs, a sharp increase in the dollar cost of their overseas operations due to adverse exchange rates, and the generally damaging impact of inflation.

--- Under these circumstances the Commission has concluded that increased federal support for advanced training and research programs in international studies is both desirable and justifiable, but that such increases should not be of an extent or type that would drastically alter the financial support pattern of these programs or threaten the integrity or independence of their professional activities. The great bulk of their support should continue to come from university and private sources.

--- The Commission feels that advanced area and transnational programs are of equal national importance but have somewhat different characteristics and needs. The area programs have developed basically as teaching programs involving the awarding of a masters degree or a formal graduate certificate of proficiency. They were always interdisciplinary and embraced both the humanities and the social sciences in their normal curriculum. One or two

have also given doctoral degrees in a particular area but this is most unusual. Typical degree candidates have first qualified for an area-based M.A. and then gone on for a doctoral degree with area specialization in a normal disciplinary department, e.g. history, political science, or language and literature. Research and publication was expected of all faculty members and was usually forthcoming. It was normally conducted on an individual basis, although team or collaborative research ventures were also quite common.

Transnational programs on the other hand usually originated within particular social science or professional departments or schools--often political science, economics, law, or business. In some cases such as international relations, foreign trade, demography, or international law they have routinely involved teaching programs, have awarded graduate degrees of a disciplinary nature, and have largely remained within their traditional disciplinary homes. For the most part transnational fields of this sort constitute a recognized sub-field for graduate work within their particular department. In other instances transnational studies have developed along more interdisciplinary lines. They have started within one or several departments more as interdisciplinary research projects than as teaching programs. Examples would be such international problems as food, environmental pollution, energy, or arms control. They have usually continued to operate more on the research than on the teaching level, although they have gradually given rise to more courses; they are not generally recognized as formal sub-fields for graduate work; and they are most frequently organized as interdisciplinary research projects whose duration is determined primarily by the availability of external funding which is usually given on a short-term basis. Since they are not in a formal sense teaching programs, they do not themselves normally award graduate degrees, although they do provide an important element of highly personalized advanced training to the graduate students working as research assistants on the projects involved.

The Commission, in making its recommendations, has tried to keep these distinctions in mind. The result has been a set of recommendations in the section on Advanced Training Programs that is geared primarily to the basic needs of advanced teaching programs such as the area centers and some transnational undertakings, e.g. curriculum development, fellowships at home and abroad, maintenance of faculty skills, organizational stability, reasonable planning horizons, outreach activities, library resources, etc. The Commission conceives of these teaching programs as activities of great national importance that merit federal support. Thanks to the Rand Corporation report, however, it is also well aware of the limited demand nationally for some types of linguistic and international skills at both the doctoral and masters levels. This consideration argues strongly for the restriction of the number of programs producing such specailists that receive federal support. This factor has been taken into particularly careful account where Recommendations I and II are concerned.

The Commission conceives of advanced research on the other hand as of general interest to all area and transnational specialists and of special interest to those transnational programs that focus their activities more on the research than on the teaching side. Its recommendations strive to

take these circumstances into account through the provision of a degree of flexibility that: 1) makes the award of all grants subject to open national competition, and 2) makes possible a variety of types and durations of federally-funded research support ranging from small individual grants of a year or less in duration to major grants for large-scale team research for periods up to five years. The latter would be renewable and would in effect constitute the research equivalent of the large teaching-oriented grants provided under Recommendation I.

Against this background the Commission recommends federal support for the following sorts of advanced training and research programs. It should be remembered in this connection that we are here discussing largely post-graduate and postdoctoral training and research. Undergraduate training and research, language training, and programs of scholarly exchange are treated elsewhere in the Report.

ADVANCED TRAINING PROGRAMS

While advanced training and advanced research programs frequently and advantageously co-exist on the same campuses, often under the same management, it is essential to distinguish between them for the substantive and procedural reasons described earlier. Both their circumstances and their needs differ where the provision of federal support is concerned.

Where advanced training programs are concerned, the following considerations are important. The facilities required for their establishment and maintenance are relatively expensive--from about $650,000 to upwards of $2,000,000 per year in operating costs on the average. Also the essential facilities cannot be easily acquired. This is particularly true of library resources in the international field. One cannot today create anew a major and well-rounded collection of materials relating to any large international area or topic except at prohibitive cost. Consequently not many universities possess the large specialized collections that are required. The same is true where professional staff is concerned. There are in any discipline a limited number of high-quality specialists with the requisite area or transnational knowledge and skills. This is particularly true of languages where area studies programs are concerned. Since the languages involved are usually non-Western, difficult, and seldom taught in this country, few universities possess the facilities and the faculty required to provide satisfactory instruction in the range of rare languages involved in many major area programs. There is also with respect to advanced training programs of this sort an important factor that might be described as "critical mass." The capacity of the programs to flourish and produce well is to an important degree enchanced by the presence on the same campus of other area or trans-national programs with which they can both compete and cooperate. There are, therefore, advantages to be gained through locating several such programs, at the same institution. Finally and most importantly, there is an important but limited need both academically and nationally for the sort of highly trained and qualified specialists that these programs produce, especially at the doctoral level. While this demand will probably increase in time--and in the Commission's estimation should increase--for the present the effective national demand for such specialists has been satisfied in a number

of areas, although there will be a continuing and significant demand for replacements. In other areas there is still an unmet and recognized need for particular mixes of area, language, and professional skills that are not commonly produced at present.

Considerations such as these argue for restricting federal support for advanced international training programs to a limited number of programs and universities in the interest of controlling the number and influencing the sorts of expertise produced while at the same time insuring the highest possible quality.

On the other hand the Commission was well aware of, and very favorably impressed by, the success of a much wider range of programs and universities in developing international studies programs at both the graduate and undergraduate level. In general the programs involved were somewhat newer in origin, smaller in faculty size and coverage, and lacked in particular the library collections, diversity of language-teaching capacities, and the "critical mass" qualifications found at a relatively few of the most outstanding universities. Their academic quality was high, however; their need for federal financial assistance was equally urgent; and their clientele in terms of both graduate and undergraduate students was large. It would be unjustifiable and unwise to ignore either the needs of these programs or their impressive contributions to our national capacities to deal effectively with international problems and opportunities.

These considerations led the Commission to recommend a three-tiered program of federal support that in certain respects relates to undergraduate as well as to advanced graduate or postdoctoral training. The three tiers would consist of: 1) a limited selection of the country's most outstanding international studies programs that would be identified as National Centers (NCs); 2) a larger number of high-quality programs that would be called Regional Centers (RCs); and 3) a nationally competitive program of federal grants designed to improve the curriculum at the B.A., B.S., and A.A. level through the development of integrated International Studies Programs (ISPs) at other universities, colleges, and community colleges. In addition to these there are further recommendations with respect to the public responsibilities of such programs, the need for global coverage on their part, library problems, professional schools, and a group of important national facilities that perform both advanced training and research functions.

Recommendation I:* The Commission recommends the establishment of sixty-five to eight-five National centers (NCs). Forty-five of these would be area centers distributed in such a manner that there would be from three to ten NCs for each of the eight major world areas (East Asia, Southeast Asia, South Asia, the Near and Middle East, the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, Western Europe, Africa, and Latin America) and one or two for special cases such as the Pacific Islands, Central Asia, or Canada.

* The estimated costs of recommendations that involve federal appropriations are set forth in Appendix I.

The other twenty to thirty NCs would be transnational centers. These would be graduate programs that treat public or private interrelationships and interactions across national borders without primary reference to a particular foreign society or area. Examples would be programs focussed on such international problems as arms control, food, population, development, energy, or environmental quality. It is the specific problem focus that is critical in this respect. Other transnational subject matter such as international relations, foreign trade, international business, or international law have already established themselves as normal curricular units in professional schools or disciplinary departments and are, therefore, in a somewhat different category.

Programs of this sort normally operate more on the research than on the teaching level. They seldom award specially denominated graduate degrees as the area programs do, and in general are apt to be organized as interdisciplinary research projects whose life expectancy depends essentially upon the availability of external financing rather than the university budget.

Because such programs have often been less permanent and less institutionalized parts of the academic scene, it is more difficult to ascertain with certainty the scale of existing resources or needs in these fields. The Commission is estimating, therefore, that twenty to thirty such transnational centers should be established in the first instance with the proviso that experience may demonstrate a need to increase this number.

This specification of area and transnational programs as separate categories is intended simply as an acknowledgement of existing circumstances of our universities. It is in no way intended to discourage innovative programs that combine the characteristics of both categories. Such developments should be encouraged and should be eligible on their merits for consideration for NC status.

NCs are interdisciplinary, area-focussed, degree or certificate-granting programs with extensive teaching responsibilities at the graduate and undergraduate levels in addition to their research functions. The defining characteristics of an NC would be the following.

1) It would obtain its status for renewable five-year terms on the basis of open national competitions conducted under the auspices of the U.S. Office of Education (or, should it be established, the Department of Education) advised by juries composed of individuals of established and outstanding professional reputation well informed about scholarship and scholars or about national needs in the relevant area field. The scholarly qualities, reputations, and knowledgeability of such juries would be of the highest importance. The criteria of selection for NCs would involve only professional excellence and the national interest. Within the five-year terms there should be interim but less intensive reviews of performance. Interim revocations of status for adequate cause should be possible. NCs that link the faculties, students, and resources of neighboring universities in joint area or transnational programs should be encouraged.

2) NC status should entitle a program to annual federal grants from the U.S. Office of Education in support of normal operating costs such as salaries, curricular planning and development, supplies and equipment, communications, visiting scholars, professional travel, conferences and workshops, editing and

publications, and modest in-house research funds.

3) NCs should receive from the Office of Education an allocation of an annual quota of graduate fellowships which they could award on the basis of national searches and competition. These should be tenable at home or abroad (the latter for language training or dissertation research purposes) for periods up to six years and in the latter case should provide travel expenses and be adjusted to particular costs of living abroad. Where tenure abroad of such fellowships is concerned, it would be desirable that they be administered as a part of the Fulbright Program so that their recipients could benefit from U.S. Embassy assistance.

4) NCs should receive from the Office of Education an allocation of an annual quota of postdoctoral fellowships tenable at home or abroad for periods up to one year which they could allocate either to their own staff for purposes of research or maintenance of language and other professional skills or, alternatively, to qualified non-staff members needed in connection with research or teaching programs being conducted by the NC. Such postdoctoral fellowships, when held abroad, should provide travel expenses and be adjusted to local costs of living.

5) NCs should receive special federal assistance that would assist them in maintaining a library collection in their field of specialization of the high quality required for advanced training and research.

Recommendation II: The Commission recommends the establishment of sixty to seventy Regional Centers. These would focus on major world areas or, alternatively, on graduate and undergraduate training programs in transnational affairs, often at the masters degree level where there is an appreciable demand for the products of this type of training. Examples of the latter would be the interdisciplinary masters' level programs in international affairs conducted by such institutions as the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Georgetown University, or the Woodrow Wilson School of Princeton University. Selection for RC status would be for renewable five-year terms and would be determined by open national competitions conducted under the auspices of the U.S. Office of Education (or, should it be established, the Department of Education) advised by juries composed of individuals of well-established professional reputation knowledgeable about scholarship, scholars, or national needs in the relevant field. The criteria involved would include geographic distribution as well as professional quality and the national interest. It is hoped that the selection system would, with due regard for scholarly quality, result in locating at least one RC or NC in each state and the District of Columbia. Within the five-year terms of RCs there should be interim but less intensive reviews of performance. Interim revocations of status for adequate cause should be possible. Programs applying for RC or NC status should be able to compete in either or both categories but should be eligible to receive standing in only one.

RC status should entitle a program to annual federal grants from the U.S. Office of Education in support of normal operating costs such as salaries, curricular planning and development, supplies and equipment, communications, visiting scholars, professional travel, conferences and workshops, editing and publication, and modest in-house research funds. An RC should also be entitled to an annual allocation of graduate fellowships which it could award on the basis of national searches and competition. These would be comparable to NC graduate fellowships in all respects save number per program.

Recommendation III: The Commission would like to recommend certain conditions with respect to the granting of federal funds in partial support of the activities and staffing of NCs and RCs. We feel that NC and RC status should carry with them responsibilities as well as privileges. The following exemplify what we have in mind.

a. Within their own institution it should be clearly understood that NCs and RCs are expected to perform major and extensive functions in the field of undergraduate education as well as advanced training and research. Both should include vocational as well as cultural options.

b. In devising cultural or vocational options where their graduate and undergraduate curricula are concerned, attention should be given to the staffing needs of national and local government, business, labor, and nongovernmental organizations as well as educational institutions, especially the needs that involve combinations of language, area, and transnational skills currently in short supply.

c. The extensive specialized research collections held by the libraries of NC and RC institutions should be made generally and conveniently available to qualified users from other institutions. A reasonable fee may be charged for the services involved. In this connection the Commission recommends the establishment by NEH and NSF of a program of grants to NCs and RCs that would enable them to provide minigrants of $100-$500 to enable qualified faculty or graduate students from other institutions to visit and make more effective use of the library collections located at NC or RC institutions.

d. As public recognition of the importance of improving and expanding foreign language and international studies grows, it will create an increasing need for training and retraining teachers to deal with these new demands at the primary, secondary, community college, and undergraduate collegiate levels. The instructional facilities of NC and RC programs should be available to qualified applicants for these purposes subject to normal tuition and fee charges. These facilities should also be available on similar terms to qualified individuals from government, business, labor, or nongovernmental organizations seeking to maintain or expand their area or transnational skills.

e. NC and RC programs should regularly undertake positive "outreach functions" aimed at stimulating and creating greater awareness, interest, and competence in foreign language and international affairs on the part of primary and secondary school systems, community and other colleges, the business and labor communities, and the public in general.

f. NC and RC programs should also provide a highly qualified, alternative, and unofficial source of expertise and information about international affairs available for consultation by the legislative, executive, or judicial branches of our national or local governments.

g. NC and RC programs should be responsible for sending at their own expense appropriate representatives to an annual meeting convened by the U.S. Office (or Department) of Education in the Washington area. The purpose of such meetings would be to review on a regular and continuing basis the state and needs of the field of international studies, demand and supply factors affecting it, national needs in this area, and collective means of meeting them.

The Commission wishes to add a note of caution to the preceding comments about the public responsibilities that should attach to the granting of NC or RC status. While activities and responsibilities of the sorts mentioned are important, it should be clearly understood that they are not the principal function of such programs and should not be enjoined or pursued to an extent that would seriously compromise the excellence of their basic professional programs. They should be viewed as ancillary functions of substantial importance. Recent experience with Title VI centers clearly demonstrates their capacity to sustain extramural programs of high quality and great public value without interference with the academic quality of their professional programs.

Recommendation IV: The Commission recommends that in selecting programs for NC or RC status attention be given to assuring that their collective coverage is truly global. A series of very costly and, in some cases, possibly avoidable national experiences--Korea, Viet-Nam, and Iran to name only the most conspicuous--demonstrate clearly the difficulty of forseeing with precision or reliability just where our national interests are apt to be seriously challenged or involved. It is prudent, therefore, to cover in varying degree all possibilities. This means in practice that some one or more NC or RC programs should be made responsible for the coverage singly or in groups of manageable size of all potentially significant foreign states. Some states or groups of states such as the Soviet Union, Western Europe, Japan, or China are of such predictable, major, and continuous importance to our national interests that they merit more extensive and intensive coverage by a number of NC or RC programs. In this connection all NC and RC programs should also keep in mind the desirability of establishing regular exchange relationships at the faculty or student level with the foreign areas on which they focus. Such exchanges, if properly managed, can give rise to more personalized and cordial relationships between the United States and other societies. Within the U.S. Government this is a matter of primary interest to the International Communication Agency. The Commission recommends the establishment of a regular and mutually beneficial relationship in this area between NCs and RCs on the one hand and the Educational and Cultural Affairs Division of ICA on the other.

Where the development of this sort of global coverage is concerned, certain cautions are in order. First, it will take time to achieve. In a number of cases we presently lack and will have to train the specialists and acquire the other resources on which the success of such a policy will ultimately depend. It would be a serious mistake to try unduly to rush such a process. Second, careful consideration should be given to related strengths already existing at established area centers. Area programs flourish best when they are part of a group of similar area and transnational activities located on the same or adjacent campuses. Isolated programs operate under severe scholarly and resource disadvantages. Finally, student demand for access to either advanced teaching or research facilities in many of the smaller or more obscure, but potentially important, languages and areas of the world will inevitably be small and certainly insufficient to justify any university's providing from its own exigent resources the salary and other costs involved. It should be recognized in such cases that the university and NC or RC concerned are supplying an important national, not local, service and that this merits special federal recognition and support.

This same sort of global coverage is recommended in the transnational sphere. Care should be taken there to insure that between the research-oriented equivalents of NCs and the transnational variety of RCs there is

adequate coverage of all major transnational problem areas such as energy, trade, economic development, food, arms control, etc.

Recommendation V: The Commission also recommends that special attention be devoted by all NC programs to their library collections. The library problem is absolutely critical to the future of international training and research in the United States. The basic difficulties are the constantly rising price of books and serials, of mailing costs, of essential processing services, and of space in which to house the materials acquired. This is worsened by adverse foreign exchange rates, and complicated still further by the fact that, if research libraries are to continue to function with reasonable effectiveness, they must in the relatively near future introduce a number of very expensive new technologies for the acquisition, identification, and processing of their holdings. Only these new technologies will make possible the sorts of effective inter-library cooperation that have now become imperative. This need merits federal assistance.

Under these circumstances it is no longer possible to treat our major libraries as discrete and autonomous units each determining its own collection policies and operating almost exclusively in terms of its own institutional and faculty interests. Some substantial measure of rationalization and systematic inter-library cooperation on a regional and national basis is essential if the country is to retain the resources necessary for the effective conduct of advanced research. The need is general and not limited to international studies. But in both the general and international cases it should be obvious that the best and most economical policy is to build upon and utilize existing strengths. In practice this means, first, building upon the relatively small number of major research libraries in the country that with few exceptions are located on the same campuses that would house the NCs and, second, adding thereto on a regional and national scale an apparatus of bibliographic control, rationalized acquisitions policies, improved access for external users, and more efficient interlibrary loan mechanisms. In this connection it would be of major advantage if the Library of Congress would undertake to expand in the near future its existing National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloguing (NPAC) to include the principal world areas that are not excluded. The Commission recommends that this be done.

Recommendation VI: The Commission recommends the establishment of a nationally competitive program of federal grants for the development or improvement of integrated International Studies Programs (ISPs) at U.S. colleges and universities, including community colleges and colleges with high minority enrollments. These programs should be at the A.A., B.A., or M.A. level and could be area and/or transnational in focus. They should offer vocationally as well as culturally oriented options to the students. In designing either culturally or vocationally oriented additions to their curricula, attention should be paid to the development of language, area, and transnational skills or combinations thereof that are presently in short supply in educational institutions, government, business, labor, or nongovernmental organizations. The program should be administered by the U.S. Office of Education. Grants should be tenable for one- to three-year periods and should be made by the Office of Education with the advice of a jury of well-qualified scholars and individuals knowledgeable about the types of training best calculated to place the graduates of these programs in suitable public or private employment. The criteria for selection should include the probable nature,

size, need, and depth of interest of the potential clientele and geographic distribution as well as scholarly and vocational merit and the national interest.

Recommendation VII: Recognizing that the graduates of our professional schools of business, law, journalism, education, agriculture, engineering, public health, etc. frequently enter careers that involve very important foreign associations and relationships and that these schools normally devote relatively little systematic attention to preparing their students for work in the international field, the Commission would urge such professional schools to consider the feasibility and desirability of adapting their present practices along the following lines:

a. Placing an increased emphasis on demonstrated fluency in some professionally significant foreign language or the possession of other significant international skills or knowledge as an important ancillary qualification for admission. The practical advantages conferred by such skills are recognized in the professions concerned. The optimal time to acquire them is, of course, prior to entering a professional school. Furthermore, admission to the better schools is so eagerly sought that a bonus for demonstrated skills of this sort in their admissions policies would in time provide a most significant improvement in our national circumstances in this respect. Among them these professions account for some of the most numerous and important relationships that the United States has abroad. It is not irrelevant that an improvement in the form of such a bonus would be cost-free to the university in monetary terms.

b. Bringing about some increase and improvement in the international content of their curricula. This would simply recognize in more explicit and systematic fashion the much heightened importance of international matters and concerns in the substance of their disciplines. Their basic concentration on U.S.-centered tools and relevant professional subject matters is essentially sound but there is certainly justification for more international courses, while some existing courses could usefully be adapted to take into account important variations of practice, approach, or philosophy in other relevant societies. This is important enough to merit federal encouragement which could be supplied through a system of one-year retraining grants tenable at home or abroad on a nationally competitive basis to younger faculty members at professional schools of collegiate rank who are seeking to acquire or upgrade their professional skills in area or transnational fields. A fellowship program administered by the U.S. Office of Education would do a great deal to improve our national capacities in this respect.

c. Encouraging joint masters degrees between area or transnational programs on the one hand and professional programs on the other. Such degrees have proven to be professional assets where initial employment possibilities are concerned, and may well become even more valuable if the current demand for the graduates of professional schools should taper off. Graduates with backgrounds of this sort bring an extraordinarily significant and valuable element of internationalization to their profession. It should be possible for them to obtain this added education through a combination of some advance planning where the nature of their undergraduate work is concerned and a program of federal assistance administered by the U.S. Office of Education that would encourage and enable them to add an additional year to their graduate training at an institution possessing suitable language, area, or transnational resources. The Rand Corporation study clearly demonstrates (in Chapters III-V)

the national need for professionals with such combinations of skills. It would be in the national interest to encourage their production.

d. Where professional schools are concerned, the Commission would also like to emphasize the seminal importance of schools of education if there is to be any long-term hope of raising the general levels of international knowledge and understanding in the United States. Ultimately the success of such a venture depends upon the national supply of teachers and school administrators competent in some branch of international studies and committed to the transmission of this knowledge to the nation's children.

Recommendation VIII: The Commission, recognizing the existence of a number of national facilities and programs essential to the quality and wellbeing of international studies in the United States, recommends a program of continuing federal support for such facilities and programs administered by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Examples would be the joint or independent area and international committees of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) and the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) that act as national research monitoring, planning, and development agencies for entire fields of international studies; the inter-university programs for advanced language studies in Tokyo, Taipei, New Delhi, and Cairo that provide the final stages of language training for the majority of the country's specialists in Japanese, Chinese, Hindi, and Arabic; IREX, the International Research and Exchanges Board that manages our exchange relations with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe; the American Academy in Rome; or the American Institute of Iranian Studies. These and others of their kind are the only national means we possess of consulting, planning, developing, and carrying out functions that are absolutely essential to the health and viability of advanced international training and research in the United States. Almost all of them stand on the brink of financial failure. Their loss would be a disaster in both academic and national interest terms.

ADVANCED RESEARCH

While advanced research in international studies is often closely linked with advanced training programs, there are numerous and important exceptions to this generalization. This and other considerations make it advisable to consider advanced research as a separate category.

The Commission has distinguished two types of advanced international research. The first we are calling "policy-relevant research." This consists of individually or collaboratively conducted research that relates in important degree to the solution of international problems of current or prospective concern to government or the national interest more broadly interpreted. The second we are calling "basic research" which we define as a residual category comprising all advanced international research where relevance to discernible governmental or national interests is either currently lacking or quite indirect in nature. Area and transnational specialists regularly conduct a good deal of research of both types.

The fact that basic research lacks any immediate policy relevance most decidedly does not mean that such research has no public value. It is the ultimate source of what we know about the history, thought, religion, social structure, language, and national characteristics of all foreign societies

and cultures and their interactions and behavior in the past and in this sense has great educational and cultural value in its own right. Knowledge of these sorts is also the basis of all expertise in the international field. There is no such thing as an area expert in contemporary French or Brazilian or Japanese foreign, strategic, or international economic policies whose professional skills are not built upon an extensive foundation of relevant prior knowledge about the language, history, social structure, politics, or economic institutions of the country concerned. The same is true of transnational experts. Their problems, too, involve a real world where the meaningful actors are foreign governments, ministries, bureaucrats, business firms, interest groups, and plain people. We invariably base our analyses of present international problems and our prognoses of future ones on our own knowledge and interpretation of the past behavior of the institutions, interests, or actors concerned. The more extensive, accurate, and reliable our knowledge of these past behaviors, the more effective our analyses and prognoses for the future are apt to be. It makes no sense, therefore, to argue that because one sizeable segment of our advanced training and research apparatus in the international sphere has no direct or immediate relevance to the solution of current policy problems, it consequently possesses less national importance or less entitlement to public and private concern and support than does advanced training and research that is policy relevant. The need for such concern is evidenced by the assertion of a senior intelligence officer interviewed in connection with the Rand Corporation study to the effect that the intelligence community is "bankrupt" in its development of a national data base on foreign countries.

Despite this close and complementary relationship between what might be called "basic" and "policy-relevant" training and research in the area and transnational fields, it is still practically useful to distinguish between the two. The national utility of the former--"basic" training and research--is more foundational, educational, and cultural in nature; whereas the national utility of the latter--policy-relevant training and research--is more instrumental, problem-focussed, and practical. Both are of enormous and neglected national importance.

There are indications that the academic barriers that have in the past usually separated area from transnational training and basic from policy-relevant research are more frequently being surmounted. In some cases this is the result of individual scholars whose training and research include substantial elements of both approaches; in others it results from collaborative research projects that include scholars from both the area and transnational camps who attempt to focus their skills on the solution of a common problem. Innovations of these sorts are not yet as common as they should be. They represent, however, a major academic contribution of high potential value to the national interest and well-being that should be given special encouragement through a policy of locating centers of advanced area and transnational training and research on the same or neighboring campuses whenever this is possible.

Along these lines it should also be noted that, while both area and transnational specialists routinely conduct both individual and collaborative research projects, these tend to be the predominant collective interest and activity of most advanced transnational programs. It seems also to be the case that collaborative research work is more common in transnational programs and individual research in area programs. These characteristics should be taken into account in the detailed design of any program of federal support for advanced research in the international field.

In this connection the Commission also wishes to emphasize certain other characteristics and needs in the field of advanced international research. There are important differences between individual and collaborative or group research. The former is much less costly on the average and normally involves only the researcher's direct costs such as released time, travel, research assistance, research materials, computing costs, etc. Individual projects may be limited to a single academic year but may well extend over several years. Provision should be available for multi-year support in such cases. Major group projects on the other hand can be quite sizeable and usually have substantially longer durations. They normally require staff, secretarial services, research assistance of a higher order and in larger numbers, communications costs, supplies and equipment, visiting scholars or fellows, conference costs, editorial and publication expenses, and indirect costs. Furthermore, such major group research projects need and should have a degree of security, stability, and continuity comparable to that afforded by the five-year renewable terms envisaged for NCs and RCs.

There may also be important differences in the most appropriate methods of providing federal funding for individual and group research projects. A grant mechanism would normally seem more suitable for the former while, depending on individual circumstances, there should be a choice between grant and contract mechanisms for the latter. Where governmental contracts are concerned, the Commission understands that the new National Council for Soviet and East European Research has, in collaboration with several executive agencies, developed new forms of research contracts that might be helpful in this context.

Policy-Relevant Research

There was a time when the government was able to meet effectively most of its research needs on an in-house basis. That time has long passed. Several things have happened where advanced research in international affairs is concerned. First, there has been a profound erosion of the barriers that once separated domestic from foreign affairs. Any major foreign policy decision today is certain to involve important domestic interests as well, and the probability is that the decision will be taken with at least one eye on its domestic antecedents and probable domestic consequences. Second, there has been an enormous expansion and complication of the issues that become the subject matter of foreign policy decisions. There is no such thing any longer as a purely strategic or political foreign policy issue. All have important economic, commercial, financial, scientific, technological, religious, environmental or ethical dimensions as well. Finally, there has been a similar and concomitant expansion of the principal actors on the foreign policy scene in two separate senses. First, the number of recognized states has tripled from fifty-odd at the beginning of the century to about 150 today. Second, the day when professional diplomats monopolized the conduct of foreign policy has disappeared. The staffing of any major American embassy abroad is a clear indication of this. The collective numbers of representatives of the military, CIA, ICA, AID, Treasury, Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, etc. normally considerably outnumber the Foreign Service officers.

All of these developments have profound consequences for the conduct of in-house research by the government on international matters. It is literally impossible for any federal agency to recruit and maintain a staff of highly

trained specialists with competence in all the fields involved. There has to be a significant and increasing degree of dependence on external assistance if our foreign affairs are to be conducted on the basis of adequate and reliable information and analysis. The same is true of our major private interests that operate abroad.

In the Commission's judgement neither the government nor private international interests have made very effective use of the informational, research, or analytic capacities of our advanced training and research programs in the international field. This is a waste of costly and valuable resources. It may not have mattered so much in times when the power and influence of the United States were preeminent internationally in political and military terms and American business dominated a number of major foreign markets. We were better able to afford waste at that time. As we enter upon far more competitive circumstances where most of our international relationships are concerned, however, we can no longer afford such extravagances.

There is a strong and ever more weighty case, therefore, for involving area NCs, RCs, and their transnational equivalents more directly and systematically in supplying information, analysis, and viewpoints as an increasingly necessary supplement to in-house governmental or private research in the international field. The practical question is how best to organize and fund such an innovation.

Given the multiplicity of federal agencies with a serious stake in access to such university-based assistance, it is clear that both the organization and funding should be on a multi-agency basis and should involve some of the following: the Departments of State, Defense, Treasury, Commerce, Agriculture, Labor, Health, Education and Welfare, the Office of Management and Budget, the International Communication Agency, National Security Council, Central Intelligence Agency, National Endowment for the Humanities, National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, Congressional Research Service, and the President's Science Advisor. The international interests of business and labor make it desirable to have representation from these circles as well as from area and transnational programs in the universities.

Although the function of such a council might relate primarily to advanced research in the international field, it would be unwise to exclude a related concern with the training programs that produce the specialists who in turn produce this research. To do so would be to lose the opportunity of creating a means whereby for the first time academics could join with representatives of government, business, and labor to consider and assess cooperatively and regularly the best means of providing the country with the human and material resources that are increasingly necessary if we are to deal effectively with the rest of the world.

Recommendation IX: The Commission recommends the establishment of a high-level Federal Council on International Research and Training with membership drawn from relevant federal agencies, private business and labor circles, and university-based international programs. The functions of such a Council would include periodic assessments of: the state and needs of unclassified international research activities both within and outside of the federal establishment; supply-demand relationships where national needs for specialized international skills are concerned; the uses being made of international specialists within

the government; and means of relating academic, governmental, and private activities and functions in the field of advanced international training and research as effectively and beneficially as possible for all concerned. The Federal Council would also be responsible for raising on an inter-agency basis and from any available private sources the funds required to support policy-relevant research of an area or transnational sort. The Commission estimates that this would require about $20,000,000 per year. Since support for such research is already a normal activity of many federal agencies, their subscriptions to such a collective fund might well appear as line items in their budgets.

A high-level, multi-agency council of this sort does not, however, seem an appropriate means of actually administering a complex national research program. In addition to the operational problems involved, this function would carry with it a degree of influence and potential control over much policy-relevant international research in the United States that would be both dangerous to the democratic process and diametrically opposed to the pluralist traditions of American education and research. It is proposed, therefore, that the actual administration of such a federally financed research program should--within broad policy limits set by the Federal Council on International Research acting with the advice of qualified scholars in the field--to be entrusted to a National Committee on International Research modelled after the recently established National Council for Soviet and East European Research. Such a National Committee could be jointly organized and administered by the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies both of which have extensive experience and an excellent record of working together in managing major scholarly ventures. The existence of such a National Committee would for the first time provide a continuing and institutionalized means of communication and mutual assistance between the federal government and academia in an area where both parties have strong interests and potentially complementary resources. Such a device has long been needed. It would also make available to the scholarly community for the first time an effective means of regularly scrutinizing academic research activities and needs in the international field from a truly national standpoint, offering advice and recommendations with respect to new areas and topics of research importance, encouraging a greater degree of cooperation and communication both domestically and internationally among the relevant scholarly groups, providing advice to governmental and private agencies with interest in the products of policy-relevant research, and affording a means of collective representation in governmental and foundation councils for the national community of scholars involved.

Where advanced policy-relevant research is concerned, note should also be taken of the unusual value attaching to collaborative research between American and foreign specialists on shared international problems. There is a real national profit to be derived from the availability of secondary and informal channels of communication and means for the collaborative exploration of difficult common problems with well informed and qualified but unofficial or semi-official representatives of foreign countries. This has been demonstrated in a variety of contexts varying from arms control and disarmament through nuclear energy to cultural diplomacy. Again, however, and despite their obvious value, it has steadily become more and more difficult to finance such ventures. The purposes served are primarily national. Some measure of explicit federal support is indicated.

Basic Research

A distinction was made earlier between policy-relevant and basic research in international studies. The latter was defined as being more foundational, educational, and cultural in nature and as lacking any immediate relevance to current or prospective problems of foreign relations. Such research underlies and is essential to the production of both area and transnational specialists and is, therefore, of great national importance. It is conducted by both area and transnational specialists. Technically some of it would be classified as humanistic in nature, some as social scientific. Like all other aspects of international studies, advanced research of this basic sort has since the 1960's suffered from a serious insufficiency of funding for both individual and collaborative research purposes. There is a strong federal stake in ameliorating these circumstances.

Recommendation X: The Commission recommends that this be done in minor part through the provision of federal grants in support of the basic operating or programmatic costs of NCs and RCs which was described earlier. The greater part of these grants would be required for salaries, curriculum improvement, supplies and equipment, communications, etc. But a small portion should be available for start-up or other minor costs of research projects. Beyond that, however, any sizeable research costs would have to come from external sources both public and private. Where the federal portion of such support is concerned, it should come through increased access to the existing fellowship and research programs of the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Science Foundation or other federal programs of similar sort such as Fulbright-Hays. At present both NEH and NSF are interested in international studies. Both could usefully do more than is presently the case however. It would be most helpful if the President and Congress could call this circumstance to their attention and request that an effort be made through either organizational or programmatic innovations to devote a larger proportion of their resources to the support of basic international research in the social sciences and humanities. They should receive budget increases for this purpose.

GOVERNMENT-ACADEMIC RELATIONS

It has been a basic conclusion of the Commission that the present state of government-academic relations in the field of advanced international training and research leaves a great deal to be desired on both sides. Where the academics are concerned, this is in some degree a reflection of the general legacies of Viet-Nam, Watergate, and our current national frustrations. More particularly, it is due to a feeling that the Government does not understand, value, or make use of their professional work; fails to appreciate the contribution they make to the society at large; and, while supporting at far more generous levels a great many other activities and causes that are in academic eyes of lesser long-term importance, denies them any but the most marginal support. Added to this are the frustrations attendant upon dealing with bureaucratic procedures and requirements. Where federal officials with international responsibilities are concerned, the circumstances are quite different. There is little or no sentiment of hostility toward academics in the international field; indeed, in general, such officials are friendly and well disposed in personal terms. The problems on the governments' side seem to be a composite of the following factors. First, they are so completely absorbed

in issues of day-to-day urgency that they tend to regard much, if not most, academic research as irrelevant to their professional concerns. Second, they do not readily see other ways, beyond the provision of preparatory training, in which academic resources can benefit their professional work. And, finally, they work under budgetary constraints that assign low priority to programs involving federal support for closer relationships with their academic counterparts. In practical terms the result has usually been a failure on both sides to explore the potentialities of more mutually supportive and beneficial relations.

This is neither a healthy nor a desirable state of affairs. Intellectual capital is one of the most precious resources the country has, especially in a field as central to the national interest as international affairs. It is for this reason that the Commission advances the following observations and recommendations with the hope that they may be conducive to the gradual creation of more mutually supportive, friendly, and beneficial relationships between the international communities in government and the universities.

First, it should be clearly understood that, together with the educational system, the government is the largest single employer of individuals with advanced training in international studies. It should, therefore, have a continuing and constructive interest in the quality and nature of the skills that our programs of advanced training supply. The Rand Corporation report makes plain the fact that, while the government is generally satisfied on this score, there are a number of important skills and combinations of skills that are either deficient in quality or in short supply. Examples would be an adequate degree of fluency in spoken foreign languages, a command of certain relatively unusual but currently important foreign languages such as Arabic, Farsi, or Korean; or particular combinations of area, linguistic, and transnational skills that qualify one to deal with problems of economic development, energy, food, or arms control in general or in particular foreign settings. This is a fact that should be of practical concern to both government and academia and merits consultation between them.

Second, there are within the government programs that could benefit from a greater infusion of international expertise, for example, the United States' numerous programs of technological assistance abroad subsumed under the rubric of AID. It is the basic function of such programs to make available to the governments and peoples of developing countries certain American knowledge, skills, and technologies that may prove helpful in the solution of local problems. Our long and uniform experience in such endeavors demonstrates conclusively the absolute necessity for the adaptation of such programs to the culture and peculiar needs and conditions that prevail in these less developed societies. The problems that ensue in the absence of such adaptation are partially cultural, partially linguistic, and partially technical. To date there is small doubt that we have been far better equipped to cope with the last of these problems--the technical one--than we have been to deal with their cultural or linguistic dimensions. As a result enormous amounts of public funds have been wasted, our present and future relations with many of the recipients of American aid programs abroad have been seriously impaired, and our national policy of providing constructive assistance to the development of Third World peoples has frequently been frustrated.

The problems involved are too complex to admit of any simple solution. But several things should be helpful. In a long-term sense it should help if

career personnel in the U.S. AID missions had some systematic training in the language or culture of foreign areas where they work. Ideally this could be obtained through the sort of joint master's degree program described earlier. If this were not practical, an intensive short-term briefing at a relevant NC or RC should be useful. In other cases there might well be more systematic exploration of the potentialities of routinely assigning trained area or transnational specialists with the linguistic and cultural skills needed to major AID missions and programs abroad. Given serious discussions between the government and relevant NCs or RCs of the particular combination of language, area, and transnational skills required, it should be possible in time to develop for the government a reliable source of supply for such badly needed talents. The proposed Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation might well be a suitable agency for the conduct of such discussions.

Third, the government's interest in academic training facilities is not limited to pre-entry education. The maintenance of professional skills in any field requires periodic renewal. Otherwise they become obsolete and out of touch with new knowledge and changing circumstances. It is a common and much neglected complaint among international specialists employed by the U.S. government that little systematic attention is paid to this need. In some cases what is required are opportunities for occasional assignments abroad, but in many others a retraining period at an appropriate university would be of great value. The mid-career sabbatical program of the Department of State is a good example of such a practice.

Fourth, the Rand study reports a great deal of critical comment within the government about the quality and limitations of its in-house research in the international field. This is characterized as extremely short-term and ad hoc in nature; as fact-gathering and reporting rather than analysis; as lacking in any systematic methodology; as failing to provide guidance with respect to underlying social, economic, or political causation or longer term trends and as ineffectual where policy determination is concerned due to poor or non-existent linkages to the higher officials or bodies that actually formulate policies. With the exception of the last, these are areas where academic research should be able usefully to supplement in-house governmental research. In fact the reported areas of governmental weakness are precisely the areas where academic research should be strongest.

Fifth, there is ample reason to believe that the government has not made an effort to learn systematically from its past international experiences. Without claiming that history repeats itself, it is still true that past experience is our best and richest guide in dealing with present and prospective international problems. One has the impression that most governmental agencies with international functions are far too busy with urgent current matters to devote much, if any, attention to reviewing recent triumphs or disasters to determine what policies worked and what did not. One wonders, for example, if anyone in the government is charged at present with the systematic exploration of the OPEC experience in such retrospective terms. This again is a case where academia could be of assistance though, given the prevailing security and classification systems, considerable time might have to elapse before this were possible. In the absence of some such arrangement, however, retrospective analyses of this sort may never be carried out and we may, most unhappily, find ourselves in Santayana's category of "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

Finally, the Rand Corporation report identifies another capacity in which academic resources in the international field may be of very significant help to the government. It reminds us that there have not infrequently been occasions of extraordinary national needs. These have usually involved wars in unexpected places such as Korea or Viet-Nam. At these times the skills and training capacities of the universities constitute the only reservoir of talents upon which the government can draw. It would be prudent to maintain such a reservoir in ready and useful condition.

While the preceding examples have been couched in terms intended to illustrate the variety of currently neglected ways in which university-based programs of advanced international training and research can be of importance to the international agencies of the federal government, they are really a catalogue of interdependencies. Academics will in fact perform these functions only by inadvertence or not at all in the absence of stimulation, consultation, and some support on the government's part. This is not really due to ill will or reluctance on their part. All of the examples cited are matters of intellectual or practical interest and concern to scholars. It is partially that, like government, they are involved in other activities and partially that they often lack the necessary financial resources.

If the potentialities of these sorts are to be realized, it will require initiatives on both sides, and these will in turn require the establishment of some shared means of assessing and discussing the problems involved, deciding upon strategies, and assigning responsibilities. Optimally, this would result in the creation of something resembling the Federal Council on International Research and Training and the National Committee on International Research described earlier. Lacking anything on this scale, it would still be possible and useful for a single federal agency or smaller group of agencies to proceed along similar lines on some more modest basis.

There are other more specific matters relating to governmental practice or conditions with respect to programs of advanced international training and research that the Commission would like to call to the attention of the President and Congress.

One would relate to the relations that have prevailed in the past between university-based international programs and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Two aspects of these relations in particular have given rise to strong academic concern. One relates to the obvious lack of status and influence of the Division of International Education within either the Office of Education or the Department as a whole. In a larger context where health and welfare frequently seem more important and influential than education and a smaller, though still very large, context in which the interests of international education appear to be a matter of only marginal and occasional concern compared to the interests of primary and secondary education, the representatives of programs of advanced international training and research programs feel very ill at ease. Secondly, there is very real concern in the academic community about the ability of its representatives in the Department to defend or implement effectively the standards of academic quality that it feels should characterize international programs receiving HEW support.

Recommendation XI: The Commission recommends that, in the event a separate Department of Education is established, there be created therein the

post of Assistant Secretary for International Education. Should a separate Department not be established, it is recommended that comparable status and access to the Commissioner of Education be accorded to the head of the Division of International Education.

Recommendation XII: The Commission recommends that the Congress authorize the transfer of Title VI of the National Defense Education Act, with the exception of Section 603, to the Higher Education At. Section 603 should be included in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This recommendation is intended to eliminate the possibility of mutually disadvantageous competition between the proponents of international education in the universities on the one hand and in the elementary and secondary schools on the other. Such a possibility is now implicit in Title VI.

In similar vein the Commission is aware of and concerned about the possibilities of mutually disadvantageous competition among a variety of the international interests that figure in its own recommendations such as the National Centers, Regional Centers, and International Studies Programs or between the training and research or area and transnational elements of these and other programs. The intent of the Commission was to recommend an integrated package of international programs all parts of which are valid, valuable, organically related, and markedly interdependent. The Commission can only urge the President and the Congress to recognize this interdependence and take steps to avoid internecine conflicts of this sort. To this end the Commission recommends that the programmatic innovations involved in its recommendations not be made at the cost of existing programs of demonstrated merit but that they be gradually phased in as increases in appropriations permit. This would apply particularly to existing Title VI graduate centers that are able to qualify for NC or RC status. Some sort of trigger mechanism might well be helpful in this respect.

Recommendation XIII: In view of the findings of the Rand Corporation in its report entitled Foreign Language and International Studies: The Marketplace and National Need (Chapter IV), the Commission recommends to the President and Congress the desirability of conducting some more detailed examination of the use made of the many thousands of area and transnational specialists employed by the executive branch of the federal government. The findings of the Rand survey indicate the possibility of serious and widespread inefficiencies in this respect. In some contexts at least it would appear that identification as a language, area, or transnational specialist is a distinct disadvantage to the career advancement of specialists.

Recommendation XIV: The Commission is aware of the discrepancy between assigning so many of the programs recommended in this report to the charge of the U.S. Office of Education (or Department of Education) and the fact that these programs and their products are of substantial interest and importance to a number of other federal agencies as well as to private interests in the universities, business, labor, the media, and non-governmental organizations. The Commission believes that these interests should be represented in the setting of policies and review of performance where those international programs administered by the Office of Education are concerned. It, therefore, recommends the establishment of an Advisory Committee on International Education representative of such interests. Members of this Committee should be selected by the federal agencies concerned and through consultation with the private sector communities involved.

V Financial Summary

We have recommended a number of programs involving various costs (See Appendix I on page 32). Federal support was also recommended at an amount that cannot yet be specified with any accuracy for the technological innovations that will enable a selection of research libraries associated with NCs to establish effective means of establishing a national system of bibliographic controls to rationalize their acquisitions and processing policies and practices. Finally, it was recommended that Basic International Research be supported largely from the existing budgets of NEH, NSF, and other similar federal agencies.

It is possible to carry out all of these recommendations under the terms of existing legislation.

Finally, the Commission would reiterate that the federal government is being asked to assume only a minor share of the total cost of supporting the country's programs of advanced training and research in the international sphere. By far the largest portion would continue to be met by local public and private entities.

APPENDIX I

ESTIMATED COSTS OF RECOMMENDED PROGRAMS

Recommendation	Purpose	Sponsoring Agency	Average annual unit cost	Overall Cost	Reference in text
I	a. Basic support for 65-85 NCs	U.S. Office of Education	$250,000*	$16,250,000 - 21,250,000	Page 14a
	b. 520-680 graduate fellowships at an average of 8 per NC	U.S. Office of Education	8,000*	4,160,000 - 5,440,000**	Page 15
	c. 195-255 postdoctoral fellowships at an average of 3 per NC	U.S. Office of Education	20,000*	3,900,000 - 5,100,000**	Page 15
	d. Library support for 65-85 NCs	U.S. Office of Education	50,000*	3,250,000 - 4,250,000	Page 15
II	a. Basic support for 60-70 RCs	U.S. Office of Education	150,000*	9,000,000 - 10,500,000	Page 16
	b. 240-280 graduate fellowships at an average of 4 per RC	U.S. Office of Education	8,000*	1,920,000 - 2,240,000**	Page 16
III	500 minigrants ($100-500) for visits to NC libraries by scholars from other institutions	National Endowment for the Humanities and National Science Foundation	300*	150,000	Page 17
VI	Basic support for 200 International Studies Programs at $200,000-80,000	U.S. Office of Education	40,000*	8,000,000	Page 19
VII	a. 100 Faculty Training Fellowships for professional schools	U.S. Office of Education	20,000*	2,000,000**	Page 20
	b. 300 graduate fellowships for degree candidates at professional schools	U.S. Office of Education	8,000*	2,400,000	Page 20
VIII	Basic support for national training and research facilities	National Endowment for the Humanities		5,000,000	Page 21
IX	Support for policy-relevant research	Fed. Council for International Research		20,000,000	Page 25
				$76,030,000 - 86,330,000**	

*In 1979 dollars.

**An adjustment for travel and living differential costs abroad should be added for one-fifth of the number of fellowships awarded.

***The presently authorized ceiling for federal expenditures under Title VI of the National Defense Education Act is $75,000,000. All recommended appropriations should be phased in over three to four fiscal years beginning in FY '81.

NDEA CENTERS: HOW THEY USE THEIR FEDERAL MONEY

Ann I. Schneider, Senior Program Specialist
Division of International Education, U.S. Office of Education

This paper is an effort to share with international studies centers -- and with members of the Presidential Commission -- data garnered by the International Studies Branch staff on the ways in which the NDEA center budgets are used, and may be used, by grantees. It is based on data in applications and final reports and many conversations with center directors, as well as the negotiated budgets.

Aggregate data on the 1978-79 academic year budgets for 80 centers are attached. The distribution of funds that the table shows hold a few small surprises but no very big ones. The Federal funds represent, overall, slightly less than 10% of the total center budget. The OE share of total budget appears to have remained constant, at 9.05% in 1976-77 and 9.1% in 1978-79. However, it should immediately be noted that this analysis concerns only the programmatic support for centers, under Section 601(a) of the NDEA. It does not include NDEA fellowship funds allocated to centers (in further support of instruction in the less commonly taught languages), nor does this analysis include data on dissertation or faculty research abroad or other Fulbright-Hays programs. The actual total dollar amounts we are discussing are, in millions:

	Federal	Total (All Sources)
1976-77	$7.25	$80.1
1978-79	8.0	87.6

Looking at the overall distribution of Federal funds, it is important to note that about 37% of the total budget is used for salaries for the core instructional program. Expenditures for language instruction have increased slightly since 1976 and for other course instruction have decreased (proportionally) somewhat. A greater shift appears in expenditues for outreach personnel (increased by 1.9%) and for administrative and library staff (also increased, by 1.8%). This last category has increased from 18.5% to 20.3%; one hopes that the increase has resulted from an increased awareness by center directors that NDEA funds may be used to add needed library staff.

At this point it might be useful to reflect on the many ways in which the funds for personnel are used. The ISB staff, in budget discussions with center directors, has long urged that NDEA funds be used for no more than 50% of any individual full time salary. This is in contrast with the situation some six or seven years ago when NDEA funds were sometimes used for full funding of tenured positions. The argument was then used that this pattern demonstrated that if Federal funds were not available the university would be forced to continue to support the program. However, this approach to budgeting does not respond to the published evaluation criterion on university commitment. More recently, centers have been persuaded to have their budgets accurately reflect the university's commitment and the precise needs for Federal funding. Thus funds are now to be used for portions of salaries of tenured personnel only when release time may be needed to prepare a new course for the center's program or to administer the center (never considered a full time job).

When Federal funds are used to encourage a department to fill a position with a specialist on the topic of the center, it is on a "seed money" basis, with the understanding that the NDEA portion of the salary (usually less than 50%) will be assumed by the department in two or three years, once the course offerings and enrollments are established. It has been suggested that a formula be required for such use of Federal funds, with the NDEA portion being phased down from one half in the first year, to one third in the second year, to one fourth in the third year (assuming a three-year funding cycle), to full university funding in the fourth year. In this way the center can increase the breadth and depth of its subject coverage in the university as a whole. Unfortunately, in recent years this strategy has had to be used by center directors increasingly to maintain the needed discipline coverage. Retirements and other departures of personnel normally create vacancies; in this time of considerable financial pressure, many departments seem to be inclined to abolish such positions or to fill them with more domestically and perhaps "vocationally" oriented specialists even in such basic fields as history and political science. In these situations too center directors have had to use the "seed money" type of encouragement to maintain the core program, let alone expand it. Obviously, this approach is used only if the deans and department chairmen are not completely persuaded about the importance of maintaining with university resources, the center's competitive edge for purpose of continuing to receive NDEA funding. All but 8 of the 1978-79 NDEA centers are in fact using some of their grant funds for instruction in fields other than language.

For language instruction, most of the funds are used for teaching assistants and native informants. NDEA funds are seldom used for the more common of the less commonly taught languages, such as Russian or even Arabic, and are always never used for Spanish (for the Latin American Centers). A quick perusal of the budgets for Middle East Centers in 1978, for example, showed only one (of twelve) to be using any NDEA funds for Arabic instruction; all were using their Federal funds for language instruction to build resources in Persian and Turkish. It should be noted that enrollments for most of the less commonly taught languages and for nearly all of the advanced levels of instruction are naturally low and constantly fall below university cut-off points for self-supporting instruction. The NDEA funds for language instruction under 601(a) -- as well as the fellowship program -- therefore play a very important role in persuading university administrations to maintain this relatively expensive training resource. Not including centers for Western Europe and General International Studies, all but two of the 1978-79 Centers are using NDEA funds for language instruction.

Another use of center funds for instruction has been for visiting lecturers, specialists who join the faculty for one or two terms. Visitors are invited by some centers to fill in for faculty on leave or to provide one or two trial runs in a department before a decision is made to hire a tenure track faculty member. Some centers have covered certain courses only with a series of visitors, an arrangement which may be the only possible modus vivendi with an unreceptive department but which usually is an indicator of less-than-ideal university commitment to the center's program. Another way in which the visiting lecturer arrangement has been used, albeit rarely, has been as a combination of the above with a quasi-postdoctoral fellowship, for a faculty member from an institution without a research library spending one or two terms at the center to teach a course and at the same time have access to the center's research facilites (library and interchange with other faculty members).

This use has considerable potential, as a way of adding depth to centers' instructional offerings and as a means for providing intellectual sustenance to the increasing number of area specialists now employed at two- and four-year colleges.

The increase in the proportion of center funds used for outreach personnel is entirely consistent with the information contained in the applications and reports -- but the impression given by the budget as a whole about outreach activities is probably quite incomplete. Not only do centers have more personnel with outreach as a specified responsibility, but a number of other personnel are also doing significant work in this category. For example, faculty members may be giving lectures to teacher workshops or may be serving as consultants on textbooks or curriculum development, probably without additional compensation. Sometimes some small amounts of salary are paid for teaching extension or summer courses. Salary paid to a teaching assistant to help with the preparation of a high school text on some aspect of the center's expertise is more likely to show up in the budget under "other course instruction" than under "outreach personnel"; the project may in fact have some spin-off in improving the university course instruction as well as providing materials for the secondary school using the result in texts.

The increasing need for centers to expand their student clientele to include enrollees in other parts of the university (i.e., professional training programs) is explanation for what may be an increase in the proportion of NDEA center budgets spent on administration. To improve student counselling and other communication about cross-registration possibilities takes considerable administrative time -- let alone clerical support, paper, and information dissemination expenses. To work out joint degree programs or appropriate certificate programs takes more of the same --and these activities are seen as increasingly important for centers to make their training resources available to students preparing for a wide variety of careers. Only two centers are currently using no NDEA funds for administration (and/or library); the range of expenditure in this category is considerable.

As the attached table shows, the distribution of NDEA funds among these salary categories varies considerably with the areas of the centers. Generally, and not surprisingly, all the areas except Latin America, Canada, Western Europe, Inner Asia, and Pacific Islands are spending more of their NDEA funds for language instruction than for other disciplines. (These exceptions, plus the general international category, are responsible for the overall percentage for "other course instruction" being somewhat higher.) At the same time, very wide variations show among the individual centers -- a few are spending no NDEA funds for language, while some are using no NDEA funds for "other" course instruction -- a matter of some concern only if the center is spending nearly 50% of its budget on administration (of what?)! Eighteen centers list no NDEA-funded personnel specially designated for outreach, but few choose not to use NDEA funds for administrative (including clerical) and/or library staff salaries; in fact the administrative salaries listed are in many instances for a combined assignment of administration and outreach.

Another somewhat surprising aspect of a comparison of the two years of budget data is the apparent proportionate decrease in funds used for both domestic and foreign travel. One might suppose that other funding sources have become

available for travel funds, but it is more likely that the centers are feeling the same kinds of pressures from other priorities -- so that in fact faculty are probably travelling less, both domestically and overseas. Increasingly centers request permission for approval of use of small amounts of money to supplement amounts available from other sources, including the travelers themselves. Despite (or perhaps in line with) the many stories one hears about restricted travel funds, particularly for trips outside the United States, nearly half of the 80 centers included no money in their 1978-79 NDEA budgets for foreign travel. The purpose of travel can vary considerably. Attendance at professional meetings (in the United States and abroad) is the most usual; other purposes include research, library and other teaching materials' acquisition, negotiation of exchanges for faculty and students, and other administrative functions. At least three centers (for Canada and Latin America) have been able to use travel funds to hire a bus to take students or teacher workshop participants "abroad" for some seminar sessions actually in the area of the center.

The apparent decrease in the proportion of the NDEA grants used for library acquisitions is a surprising factor in this budget analysis. Whereas in 1976-77, centers spent, on the average, 12.6% of their budgets on library acquisitions, the average for 1978-79 is only 11.1%. Whether this indicates that alternative funding sources for library and other teaching materials have been developed or that the acquisition rate is being cut back generally is unclear, but there are some indications that the latter is the case. The attached table shows some considerable variation by world area, some of it explicable by the fact that most centers for South Asia and the Middle East currently receive foreign publications through arrangements under P.L. 480. All but two centers are using some NDEA funding for library and materials acquisition; the largest amount budgeted for NDEA funds is in the neighborhood of $0,000. Included in this category of "library" expenditures are the materials acquired by centers for development of resource centers which are used increasingly by elementary and secondary school teachers. The university libraries themselves, of course, are also used extensively through various inter-library loan arrangements. Some center libraries are also responding increasingly to individual scholars' requests for bibliographic and other assistance -- which is the reason for postulating in the foregoing that some increases in salary expenditures are probably for library staff. At least one center has developed (with the help of other outside funding) research resources and staff to the point that scholars are invited from all over the country to participate in an annual "summer research laboratory" which includes seminars for participating researchers and considerable library staff assistance for visiting scholars.

The visiting lecturer category of the budget is used for travel, per diem, and honoraria for specialists visiting the center to give one or more special talks, to classes, to special seminars, and to the general community. Center directors have increasingly noted how important this part of the center's activity is in exposing students to points of view, disciplines, and topical approaches not otherwise represented in the centers' coverage. The proportion of the NDEA budget for this item is, for some reason, exactly the same, at 2.7%, for both 1976-77 and 1978-79. Increasingly, centers are trying to coordinate their invitations, especially to specialists coming from overseas, so that several institutions may benefit from one such major trip. Centers are also making increasing efforts to publicize such events at other institutions and to arrange special seminars for the visitor with a number of faculty members and sometimes

graduate students at institutions in the center's region. NDEA funds have been used to pay travel expenses for the visitor to actually spend some time on several campuses (non NDEA-funded).

The conferences and workshops category almost exclusively involves outreach activities. The actual NDEA expenditures here are again only travel, per diem, and honoraria of lecturers and discussants and travel only for participants (if budget permits). The participants may be faculty from other institutions, elementary and secondary school teachers, business representatives, journalists, or other special groups. The topics may be current research and subjects on which the center has special expertise, teaching materials, methodology, or curriculum development -- to give some examples. Sixty-eight centers are using NDEA funds for such activities, and most of the remaining 12 are using other funding sources for similar activities.

The "other" category consists of the usual 8% indirect cost and usually some office supplies. Interestingly, the proportion of grant funds for this category has decreased from 1976-19[illegible], when it was 12.8%, to 12.1% in 1978-79; however, the actual dollar amount has in fact increased slightly.

A comparison of the bottom line of the attached table -- the NDEA grant as a percentage of the total center budget -- with the same data for 1976-77 shows some interesting, and perhaps significant, changes. Overall, as noted earlier, the NDEA funds are about the same proportion of the total in 1978-79 as they were in 1976-77. Only two categories of centers indicate less (proportionate) dependence on Federal funds. The Middle East Centers' Federal funding, while increasing in actual dollars, has decreased as a percentage of their total budgets, from 9.6% to 8.8%, perhaps because those centers have been able to obtain significantly increased funding from other outside sources. The other category showing an increase is "other", where the increase may be explained by more complete reporting, in budgetary terms, of the universities' actual resources for those centers. In any case, the important point may be that all the remaining categories show, proportionally, a slightly increasing dependence on Federal funds from 1976-79. It may also be noted that while NDEA funding for centers increased by about 10% between 1976-77 and 1978-79, the total center budgets, from all sources, have increased by only about 9% and the inflation rate over the two-year period has been considerably more. At the same time, the OE regulations for the centers program specify, as an evaluation criterion, an increasing range of activities.

But perhaps the main point which this paper is intended to convey is the flexibility of funding patterns which are possible under the NDEA centers program. As noted in the foregoing, the variations of expenditure in each category are very wide, with some centers using no Federal funds for items which, for others, are critical to the continuation of their standards and rate of growth. Within each category a number of examples of the ways in which funds are used have been offered, but the enumeration is by no means exhaustive. Center directors have been, and will doubtless continue to be, imaginative and resourceful in their use and stretching of the Federal dollars available to them.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Division of International Education
International Studies Branch

NDEA International Studies Centers
Budget Analysis 1978-79

	EA	SEA	SA	ME	AF	EE	LA	Int'l Studies	Other*	Total
NDEA Budget Allocation										
Salaries										
Language Instruction	19.1%	13.7%	24.0%	26.7%	17.1%	21.8%	10.9%		8.6%	18.1%
Other Course Instruction	15.2%	10.7%	19.7%	23.1%	11.8%	16.6%	16.6%	44.9%	23.7%	18.7%
Special Outreach Personnel	9.0%	9.8%	10.7%	7.7%	6.9%	7.4%	9.6%	5.5%	7.7%	8.3%
Administrative & Library Staff	20.1%	23.2%	19.5%	18.7%	22.4%	18.6%	24.2%	15.9%	20.6%	20.3%
Travel										
Domestic	2.9%	3.1%	2.5%	1.6%	5.0%	4.2%	5.1%	6.0%	3.8%	3.6%
Foreign	.4%	1.2%	1.8%	.6%	4.0%	1.3%	4.7%	3.0%	3.2%	1.9%
Library Acquisitions	15.0%	21.7%	4.7%	8.4%	13.1%	12.7%	10.1%	6.0%	5.5%	11.1%
Visiting Lecturers	1.2%	2.6%	2.5%	1.3%	3.4%	3.3%	3.1%	3.2%	7.2%	2.7%
Conferences & Workshops	3.5%	1.0%	2.1%	1.9%	4.3%	1.7%	4.7%	3.3%	7.0%	3.1%
Other (including indirect cost)	13.7%	12.9%	12.5%	10.0%	12.0%	12.4%	11.0%	12.2%	12.7%	12.1%
NDEA Grant as % of Total Center Budget	7.5%	19.2%	13.9%	8.8%	13.3%	8.6%	9.1%	10.5%	11.2%	9.1%

*Canada, Western Europe, Inner Asia, and Pacific Islands

INTERNATIONAI STUDIES AND RESEARCH LIBRARY NEEDS

William E. Carter, Chief
Hispanic Division, Library of Congress

The story of area studies expansion during and following World War II is well known. Before that expansion, only a handful of university libraries had a tradition of acquiring materials from third world areas such as Africa, Asia, and Latin America.[1] This historical neglect was not easy to overcome. Even as late as 1964, Paul Berry, then coordinator for the Development of the Collections at the Library of Congress, could write that although, in the previous decade, libraries had "made intensive efforts, both individually and cooperatively to acquire significant materials from all foreign areas,"... "their collections are still not fully adequate for many areas, particularly the non-Western."[2]

The realization that our foreign library holdings, particularly those for the third world, were so inadequate came as a natural product of growing academic and political interest in the cultures, societies, and languages of that world. As programs of non-Western studies developed, so did the need and demand for specialized and often inaccessible resource materials.[3] Beginning in the 1950's, both private foundations and the federal government responded to this newly felt need by granting handsome subsidies for the development of area studies collections. And, in a massive matching effort, individual universities and libraries diverted resources so that, in a relatively brief period of time, there was impressive growth of both current and retrospective area studies materials. While substantial however, support from both the foundations and the federal government was of relatively short duration. From the beginning, the foundations had clearly indicated that their effort was intended as only an initial stimulus. They would not and could not become involved in long term, operational support. Although the federal government never stated that such was its policy, the results of its actions were similar. During the late 1960's, the percentage of federal area studies support channeled into library activities tended gradually to diminish, and then dropped markedly during the decade of the 70's. Even in those few cases where the dollar amount remained constant, inflation severely eroded the purchasing power of the ongoing subsidy.

At the very time this was happening, the universities themselves were experiencing ever greater budgetary pressures. These tended to be most severe in those very private universities that had been at the vanguard of area studies development, making it increasingly clear not only that universities would fail to increase their support for area studies collections, but that even the best endowed would be forced into retrenchment. Whenever budget constraints appeared, area studies collections tended to be early and prime targets. The materials in those collections were perceived to be outside of the major concerns of the university, and, compared with materials from the United States, use rate was low and unit costs were high.[4]

Yet, in spite of these problems, the United States succeeded in building a major national resource in barely twenty years. This was no mean accomplishment. Carnegie, Rockefeller and Ford grants had helped initiate the process, but they had never been meant to provide indefinite funding. The general expec-

tation had been that the federal government would carry on when foundation funding waned, but this has not really happened. Nor have universities been in a position to fill the breach.

We thus have reached a plateau of development, and have even begun to slip backward. The critical nature of our present situation can be illustrated by the comments of Carolyn Bucknall, assistant director for collection development at the University of Texas, as these were presented before the President's Commission Houston hearings. She pointed out that, although the University of Texas library system is one of the great ones of the region and nation, it is able to buy increasingly less because of the declining purchasing power of the dollar. Of their total budget, 60 percent is spent for foreign materials, and even this is insufficient to cover their needs today.

The need to economize is shared by all major research libraries today, including the Library of Congress. The pressure is manifold, and includes acquisitions, cataloging, and bibliographic control. And the reasons are equally manifold. They were clearly stated in a 1977 report.

1) The rapid expansion, especially in recent decades, in the scope of university fields of research and teaching interest;

2) continuing exponential increases in the production of relevant literature at rates well in excess of library growth rates;

3) rapid increases in the unit costs for virtually all library operations, publications, and space;

4) changes in the structure of the literature - e.g., the increasing number and importance of serial publications.[5]

It is self evident that, without adequate information collection and retrieval, high level area studies research will be severely hampered. Our area studies collections constitute, in effect, the basic record of man. This we must maintain and expand if we are at all serious about world leadership.

Much that is found today in our major collections is unique. In many cases, it is the only extant record in the entire world. It may be used with astonishingly low frequency, but nevertheless be of extreme importance to scholarship. In no way can the acquisition of foreign materials be decided on the basis of frequency of use, even though, as the cost of acquiring, processing, and servicing foreign materials spirals, a great temptation is to focus on those items that are most heavily used and most easily obtainable. If all our major research libraries succumb to this temptation, we could end up spending a prodigious amount of time and effort and still miss irreplaceable items of unique research value. We cannot rely on their being collected in the country of origin. The ACE report on library resources for international education noted, for example, that national libraries are nonexistent in many countries of the world, and that even in India, a country having one of the best library systems of South Asia, the National Library was collecting (during the early 1970's) less than 60 per cent of local publications.

It is obvious that no single institution can collect everything. Nor indeed should it. Some materials have little or no research value. Examples

given low priority in institutions like the Library of Congress include textbooks, exhibition catalogs, anthologies, popular instructional and devotional publications, unrevised reprints, facsimile editions, sport and recreation, applied arts and crafts, translations, and popularizations in all subjects.

All too often in the past, in the great desire to develop retrospective holdings and thus make up for chronic neglect, the success of acquisitions activity has been judged more from the standpoint of quantity than of quality. We are now realizing that far more care must be taken in the selection process. We are also becoming increasingly aware that the availability of materials in many countries is limited. The establishment of overseas offices of the Library of Congress to acquire materials jointly for its own and other libraries has led to a partial solution to this problem. But there still remain situations in which competition among several research libraries or centers serves only to exacerbate the inflation of prices, especially for unique or scarce materials.

Recognition of problems such as these is leading to increasing cooperation among major repositories. One of the first organizations founded specifically to stimulate cooperation for acquisitions activities is the Seminar on the Acquisition of Latin American Library materials. This group began to meet in 1956, and is still coming together on an annual basis. One of its major accomplishments was the development of a cooperative book buying plan for trade books from Latin America, a plan that, because of various difficulties, no longer exists.

Selection and acquisitions are merely the initial problems in handling of foreign materials. Cataloging presents subsequent and more serious ones. The major institution handling cataloging in the United States today is the Library of Congress. There, routine cataloging is costing from 50$ to 65$ per item - usually several times the item's purchase price. Exotic language materials present special problems. For many languages of the world, the Library of Congress is the only institution in the entire country with qualified catalogers. And many of these are emigres. The problem must be addressed as to how these cataloging needs will be staffed, once this generation of emigres moves into retirement years.

Other absolutely essential facets of any research library operation are collection management, bibliographic control, and preservation. In general, these activities must be part of the ongoing budget of an institution. They seldom are considered glamorous and chronically suffer from lack of support.

Given these many problems, cooperation and coordination are no longer the issue. The question has rather become "how" and "to what extent". Some examples of recent thinking are the following

> The era of unrestrained free enterprise in our educational activities appears to be over, at least for the immediate future. Currently funds for foreign travel research are shrinking and it is likely that academic researchers will increasingly turn inward to available resources in libraries which themselves will be feeling the pinch of restricted finances. It is a time, therefore, when we will need

> to find ways to make the best possible use of financial resources available to us, to increase our cooperative efforts and the sharing of resources, and to avoid any unnecessary duplicative efforts, if libraries are to provide services to interested users throughout the country.[8]

> Some libraries have attempted to be all things to all men, others have been more modest in their goals, but the coordination of these activities for the purpose of ensuring an integrative development of reasonably comprehensive, locatable and accessible national resources remains to be accomplished.[9]

> Most research libraries - though probably not most scholars - have now accepted the necessity for some system for sharing infrequently used resources. The primary question is no longer whether sharing is necessary but rather how it can best be accomplished.[10]

> The consensus appears to be that the future points towards consolidation rather than proliferation, cooperation rather than competition. As in other areas, it is no longer wise or economically feasible to try to build a comprehensive library collection at every institution engaged in East Asian studies. Moreover, the persistence of the current monetary inflation suggests that the goal of a "complete" collection is becoming increasingly elusive, a chimera not to be realized. Libraries have always shared resources but the time seems to have come when we must devise new and innovative cooperative schemes. We must find the wit to develop these schemes and success demands leadership at the national level beyond that yet evolved.[11]

Early landmarks in cooperative programs were the Farmington Plan, begun in 1942, and the cooperative acquisitions project of the Library of Congress Mission to Europe, active from 1944 to 1948. The idea of the Farmington Plan was to assign collecting responsibilities for given countries to specific research libraries across the country. Its goal was to assure that at least one copy of every publication of research value be available at some point within the nation's boundaries.

The plan was launched with great enthusiasm, and functioned well during its initial years. Resources were relatively plentiful, and the volume of materials far more manageable than today. By the 1970's however, the plan had died. Its demise would merit careful study, for it could indicate what should be avoided if future cooperative programs are to succeed.

Even without such scrutiny, it is easy to see that the plan had several weaknesses. The two most basic appear to have been the fact that its implementation depended entirely on the good will and ongoing financial support of each repository library, and the fact that faculty interest at a given institution tended to change from one geographical area to another over the years. No national support existed, nor was there any ongoing nation-wide supervision. Thus, when declining enrollment and inflation began to take their toll, acquisition and servicing of rarely used foreign materials became ever harder to defend from a local institutional point of view. When the core faculty strength at a given institution also changed, to the point that practically no one was left who specialized in the geographical area for which that institution had ongoing responsibility, expenditure of scarce funds became even harder to justify.

Over the years the plan suffered from unwarranted criticism. Perhaps the most common was that a single volume is insufficient to meet the research needs of scholars. Those who presented this argument appear to have confused the plan's intent to guarantee that at least one copy of each piece of research quality foreign material be found somewhere in the country with the idea that no more than one such item be obtained for the entire country. The two were never intended to be synonymous.

Following in the tradition of the 1944 to 1948 Library of Congress Mission to Europe, there have been two other major cooperative efforts for the acquisition of foreign materials. The fact that both were tied into cataloging responsibilities and activities and that both were funded at the federal level probably accounts, in large measure, for their success.

The first of these efforts was the PL 480 program, known today as the special foreign currency program. Using counterpart funds, Library of Congress centers were established to cover nine countries: India, the United Arab Republic (Egypt), Pakistan, Israel, Yugoslavia, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Nepal, and Poland. From 1962 to 1979, i.e., since they first began, a total of $38,575,143 was spent on their operations, of which $35,711,000 was in foreign currencies.

Today special foreign currency centers exist in only three countries: India, Egypt, and Pakistan. In Indonesia the operation has been converted into a dollar funded effort through the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging, supported by appropriated funds and contributions of participating libraries.

The special foreign currency program has received accolades from many sides, and was described by one author as "the bright example of 'how to succeed'."

> When it comes to acquiring and cataloging publications from those areas of the Eastern world where the book trade is undeveloped, we have proved that the work is done best when one central agency does it for all. We have never before had such success in getting and organizing the publications of any countries of the non-Western world as we now enjoy in those where the Public Law 480 is operative.[12]

The suggestion is then made that, even though special foreign currency programs are not possible in most of the world, the concept they embody, of centralized acquisitions and cataloging of materials from the non-Western world, is the only viable way that the larger universities will be able to develop the collections that will be demanded in the not-too-distant future. This sort of centralized effort could be implemented only with at least some modicum of federal support.[13]

In a sense, NPAC represents precisely this type of program and effort. Developed in cooperation with the Association of Research Libraries, NPAC has succeeded in obtaining better coverage for a number of countries and in reducing the costs of both acquisitions and cataloging.[14] Areas covered by NPAC include Australia, New Zealand, most of Western and Eastern Europe, Japan, Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, East Africa, and Brazil. This still leaves some important areas without coverage, of which West Africa and Hispanic Latin America are the most critical.

For the research library community as a whole, the greatest benefit accruing from NPAC is cataloging, with the concomitant preparation and distribution of LC cataloging in the form of printed cards and computer tapes. The availability of this cataloging facilitates the development of various types of bibliographic controls, varying in coverage from accessions lists to union catalogs. Yet, because NPAC covers only a few of the world's many countries, the need for bibliographic control for most of the world remains a serious one.[15]

Hardly anyone charged with maintaining the strength of our major research libraries today would challenge the importance of increasing cooperation. The amount of research quality foreign materials being produced far outstrips the capacity of any single institution, save perhaps the Library of Congress itself, and, even for that institution, the processing demands of such volumes of data are overwhelming. Forgotten all too frequently is the additional problem of shelving, service, and access. Without constantly increasing support, these problems simply cannot be adequately addressed, and any viable national strategy must take this fact into full account.[16]

One successful approach to the sharing of responsibility has been a recent series of cooperative microform projects. Examples are projects sponsored by the Center for Research Libraries, covering microforms from Africa (CAMP), Latin America (LAMP), Southeast Asia (SEAM), etc., and the current project for the microfilming of Latin American Gazettes held in the

New York Public Library and the Library of Congress. Another approach is a National Periodicals Center. The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science described the need for such a center in its 1977 document Effective Access to Periodical Literature, and the Council on Library Resources formulated a plan, published in 1978 as A National Periodicals Center Technical Development Plan.

The Center could function under the aegis of either the Library of Congress or any other agency prepared to accept the responsibility. Its specific objectives would be:

1. To provide a reliable method of access to a comprehensive collection of periodical literature.

2. To reduce the overall costs of acquiring periodical material by interlibrary loan.

3. To reduce the time required to obtain requested material.

4. To assure that, for any document delivered through the NPC, all required copyright fees and obligations will have been paid.

5. To act, under appropriate conditions, as a distribution agent for publishers.

6. To provide libraries with additional options as they establish their own collection development and maintenance policies.

7. To promote the development of local and regional resource sharing.

8. To contribute to the preservation of periodical material.

9. To provide a base for the development of new and imaginative publication strategies.

10. To provide a working example of a national access service that might be extended to other categories of materials.[17]

The Center would initially house only about 36,000 of the estimated 200,000 currently published periodicals, with primary focus on those materials in great demand. For access to less commonly used materials, NPC would contract with referral libraries, and through these provide service to requesting libraries desiring specific titles not in the NPC collection.[18]

The question as to whether such a Center ever comes into being continues to be an open one. But whether this or some other institutional arrangement emerges, it is clear that close cooperation is the mandate for the future.

While no single library can be expected to collect everything for every part of the world, there is general consensus that the Library of Congress is and will continue to be the most comprehensive of all. Many, for better or for worse, are now referring to it as the library of last resort. Others are looking to it as the library of first resort. What it neither can nor should be is the library of only resort.

Just as our national political structure is a federated structure, so our national library structure is and should be a decentralized structure. Because this is so, the importance of cooperation cannot be overemphasized. Such cooperation should include at least the following:

1. A precise definition of the resources needed for present and future scholarly endeavor.

2. A systematic and comprehensive approach to acquiring these resources.

3. An organization to index these resources under uniform bibliographic format.

4. Coordinated access to these indices.

5. A communication system to transmit requests and exchange messages promptly - e.g., teletype, computer data bases, and telefacsimile networks.

6. A faster, more dependable delivery system than is now available through the traditional interlibrary loan operation.[18]

By implementing such cooperation, the nation as a whole could develop a far better resource base than it ever could if each library were to attempt comprehensive coverage, in direct competition with every other library.

Given the continuing explosion of research materials and the ongoing inflationary spiral, it would seem reasonable that all but the largest libraries should be encouraged to focus their acquisitions on areas of outstanding strength. Where this strength is sufficient to constitute a major national resource, it should be recognized as such and the library designated as a special repository, with all the implications this would have for local, regional, federal, and foundation support. Under no circumstances should outstanding collections such as the Soviet collection of the New York Public Library be allowed to atrophy.

By its very existence, the President's Commission on Language and International Studies shares the burden of maintaining this country's data base for the serious study and understanding of the rest of the world. It could speak to the issue in many ways. But two would seem to be basic. The first would be to encourage the continued growth of shared programs and activities among this country's major research libraries. And the second would be to assure that major collections be formally acknowledged as the national resources that they, in fact, are. This would have direct implications for federal funding.

Although the number of needs that the Commission could address are almost limitless, in terms of libraries, a few stand out above the rest. Commission support and endorsement would greatly enhance the likelihood that these needs would be met:

1. Maintenance of at least the present excellence of coverage at the Library of Congress - the largest and most complete library in the nation - and for many the library of last resort.

2. Increasing, rather than decreasing, sharing of responsibility for coverage and service among all major research libraries.

3. Maintenance of the special foreign currency centers as long as special foreign currency resources are available and the local book trade is inadequately organized.

4. Conversion of these centers to dollar funded programs if a need still exists when the special foreign currencies are no longer available. This would require congressional appropriations. Presently NPAC centers require from $100,000 to $211,000 each for administrative expenses alone.

5. Creation of new NPAC centers in areas poorly covered. Two prime examples are Hispanic Latin America and West Africa. China could be another such example in the near future.

6. Formal recognition of regional repository libraries, where specialized materials would be collected, cataloged, housed, serviced, and preserved. These would be in addition to the copies contained in the Library of Congress, rather than being a substitute for them.

   A model for these repository libraries was contained in a statement submitted to the President's Commission by the executive council of SALAM (Seminar on the Acquisition of Latin American Materials). According to that model, to qualify for consideration as a regional repository, a given library should already have (for Latin American Materials) a base of 150,000 volumes and an acquisitions budget of at least $50,000. Each library designated as a repository would receive regular federal funding ($100,000 annually is the suggested figure), in return for which it would accept responsibility for materials from a given country or, in the case of small countries, a group of countries. This responsibility would include shared cataloging and bibliographic control. Acquisitions could be handled, in part, through joint endeavors, as is already being done in some of the NPAC centers.

   Repository institutions could be chosen through competitive bidding and evaluations by an impartial panel of experts, and commitments would, perforce, be long term. Each institution would have to accept the fact that, in return for an ongoing federal subsidy, it would have to shoulder national responsibility, regardless of changing faculty interest.

7. Computerization of cataloging and bibliographic operations. No institution should be named a repository library if it is not taking concrete steps to tie into the emerging nationwide computerized network, and if it is not using cataloging formats compatible with national bibliographic standards. Through such standardization, once the system is in place, the user could request an item from his local institutional library. If it is not there, an almost instant search could be made of the holdings in other libraries of the region, then of the quadrant of the nation in which the institution is located, and finally of the nation as a whole.

8. It should be recognized that foreign materials are central, not peripheral to major research libraries. Approximately two-thirds of all current receipts at the Library of Congress fall into the foreign language category, and this would seem to be typical of major research libraries. From Carolyn Bucknall's testimony at the Houston hearings of the Commission, we learn, for example, that 60 per cent of the University of Texas acquisitions budget is for foreign materials.

9. The many cooperative programs needed for maintaining strength in foreign materials could be greatly facilitated through the creation of a national secretariat, as suggested in the ACE 1975 report on library resources for international education.

   The greatest problems today are not technological. They are financial and political. Because this is so, it would probably be advisable for such a secretariat to be located outside government, though it could possibly be funded through competitive bidding for federal support on a 5-year renewable basis. It would probably cost at least $150,000 per year, and could be located within organizations such as ARL or ACE itself.

10. Increased sharing of responsibility is inevitable. In terms of acquisitions, we know that the more overseas offices we have, the better is our coverage. The creation of these additional offices presents an ever present challenge.

11. Should such additional offices be created, preliminary cataloging could probably be handled for much material at the point of origin. Final cataloging could then be assumed by the repository libraries.

12. Bibliographic control, though seldom a conscious part of library budgets, is of ever greater importance. Materials are of value only if they are retrievable, and bibliographies are one of the basic tools to make them so.

13. Given the poor quality of many foreign publications, preservation will become increasingly crucial in the future. Budget projections and plans must take cognizance of this fact.

14. The United States has benefited enormously since the second World War from the skills of emigre labor. It is doubtful that, in the next generation, we will be similarly blessed. Thus we face an urgent need to produce trained specialists who can handle our acquisitions, cataloging, bibliographic, and service needs in the future particularly for East European, Middle Eastern, Asian, and African materials.

   Although many problems have already been solved, the overriding one of keeping abreast with man's global record is not, and never will be. As is life itself, this is an ongoing process. And, as does life, this also requires uninterrupted support. By speaking strongly of the central role of libraries to research, training, and decision making, and of the urgent need for expanded support, the Commission could help guarantee that this support be provided.

REFERENCES CITED

1. American Council on Education. Task Force on Library Information Resources. Library resources for international education. Washington, 1975. p. 7.

2. Berry, Paul. Development of library resources. In American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia. Annals, v 356, Nov., 1964. p. 126.

3. Berry, Paul. Op. cit., p. 127.

4. American Council on Education. Task Force on Library and Information Resources. Library resources for international education. Washington, 1975. p. 29.

5. American Council f Learned Societies. Steering Committee for a Study of the Problems of East Asian Libraries. East Asian libraries: problems and prospects. [n.p.] 1977. p. 29.

6. American Council on Education. Task Force on Library and Information Resources. Op. cit., p. 54.

7. Berry, Paul. Op. cit., p. 129.

8. American Council on Education. Task Force on Library and Information Resources. Op. cit., p. 23-24.

9. American Council on Education. Task Force on Library and Information Resources. Op. cit., p. 52.

10. American Council of Learned Societies. Steering Committee for a Study of the Problems of East Asian Libraries. Op. cit., p. 30.

11. U.S. Congress. House Committee on Education and Labor. Task Force on International Education. International education: past, present, problems and prospects. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1966. p. 264.

12. Tsuneishi, Warren. Impact on American libraries of current trends in oriental area studies. In International Congress of Orientalists, 28th, Canberra, Australia, 1971. International co-operation in Orientalist librarianship. Canberra, National Library of Australia, 1972. p. 99.

13. American Council on Education. Task Force on Library and Information Resources. Op. cit., p. 21.

14. Tsuneishi, Warren. Op. cit., p. 97-98.

15. Tsuneishi, Warren. Op. cit., p. 98

16. American Council on Education. Task Force on Library Information Resources. Op. cit., p. 30.

17 Council on Library Resources. A national periodicals center technical development plan. Washington, 1978. p. 1-175.

18. American Council on Education. Task Force on Library Information Resources. Op. cit., p. 76.

THE U.S. GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT OF FOREIGN AREA AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES SPECIALISTS

James R. Ruchti
Foreign Service Officer
U.S. Department of State

Overview

The United States Government (USG) currently has an estimated 14,000 positions which require specialized knowledge of foreign areas or countries[1] or skills in international studies.[2] There are probably an additional 5,000 positions where these skills are de facto requirements. Frequently, but not always, incumbents in these positions also have matching skills in languages related to countries in their geographic area. Many employees have academic credentials in such fields as political science or economics.

The USG needs these categories, which are commonly called foreign area specialists, primarily to follow and assess developments in other countries and regions. Foreign area specialists interpret trends and events abroad for U.S. policy-makers operating in such vital and diverse sectors as security, foreign policy, international cooperation and many branches of economics. Equally USG communications and interpretation of American society to others require the cross-cultural capabilities of area specialists to make American interests and positions both understandable and relevant. In sum, area specialists are essential catalysts to the short- and long-term operations and decision-making processes of the USG in dealing with other governments and people.

Largely because numbers are relatively small and the present supply of area specialists far exceeds current demand, the agencies of the USG generally have an abundance of talent from which to choose for direct hire. Nevertheless, there is a trend, especially among the defense-security agencies, to supplement recruitment by training as area specialists, selected candidates from on-board employees who have acquired professional disciplines relevant to the agency concerned. However, USG training in government schools is a much less significant factor in producing or augmenting the supply of specialists than it is in foreign languages. The dependence of the USG on the academic institutions to provide area specialists is correspondingly greater.

---

1. Area is used in the USG as elsewhere, in a mixed geographic and cultural sense. The principal areas, and the countries in them, are: Africa (South of Sahara), Asia (Northeast, Southeast, and South), Europe (East, West, and USSR), Latin America, and Middle East-North Africa.

2. International Studies is a term used to describe a specialized discipline cutting across geographic and cultural lines. Examples are: international trade, international politics, military security assistance and arms transfers, terrorism, and narcotics trade.

Judging by training figures, the trends in employment of area specialists in the immediate future (next 5 years) is up. Several agencies (State and Defense particularly) want more area specialists. While absolute numbers are not great, the downward cycle of the last few years seems to be reversing. The reasons for the change are varied, but the most commonly cited reflect a renewed perception among policy-makers and managers that the USG foreign affairs agencies need increased analytical capability and, consequently, more and better trained area specialists. Recent events in the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America, no doubt, have stimulated the managers to move sooner and further than the usual historical cycle would have indicated.

Still, the USG job-market for area specialists per se will remain tight for the next 5-10 years according to most agencies. Supply dominates the market. No doubt, some shortages will turn up from time to time if unexpected events, such as Angola, crop up. As with foreign languages, agencies increasingly want prospective employees to have both a discipline and area expertise. Persons offering these combinations have a substantial advantage over pure language or pure area specialists for most jobs.

Turnover rates for current employees are estimated to be about the same as for languages, that is, averaging somewhat below the 9-10% per annum for professionals in the USG as a whole. The turnover rate differential between agencies is less than with linguists if the Peace Corps is omitted. The turnover for Peace Corps Volunteers (50%) and staff (30%) is deliberately built into the system since the Peace Corps serves an altogether different function from other agencies. The following are the estimated number of annual job openings for area specialists in the USG:

Civilian agencies	1150
Defense-Security agencies	250
Peace Corps (staff and volunteers)	2700
Total	4100
Total without Peace Corps	1400

No doubt there are additional positions where area competence is a hiring plus, but the requirements in the job descriptions omit mentioning the specialty. The USG has no reliable basis for estimating the number of these de facto area specialist positions either in total or on annual turnover basis.

The USG also uses academic institutions, individual scholars, and consultant firms to provide research on a wide variety of area and international subjects. Quantitatively, end-users in various agencies find this "external" research of generally good quality with highest marks going to a handful of consultant firms which have more experience with government and more control over their product.

The bottom line for the government is the existence and maintenance of the base in the various institutions of the country which provide the human resources the government requires as employees, researchers, or consultants. There are, at best, modest incentives for the next five years for the USG agencies to increase their allocations to academic and research institutions. Nevertheless, it is equally clear that the USG and most of its components would benefit from closer cooperation and coordination both internally and with the private business and academic circles in making better use of the nation's intellectual capabilities in foreign areas and international studies.

Observations and Conclusions

1. The USG has no standard definition for "area specialist" or for a person with competence in international studies. The most commonly cited qualifications are: appropriate language skills for the area/country/region; several years adult residence in the area either for work or study; travel or frequent and recent visits to the area; and academic study in the U.S., or a third country, with an undergraduate major in the area of international subject. The absence of criteria or of a consensus on values of individual qualities makes the collection of data difficult and results imprecise. Therefore, there is a natural tendency to put substantial weight on academic degrees and on professional experience in measuring quantities and qualifications in the area or subject field because these items appear on position lists or individual job applications.

Nevertheless, the net result is that the USG and most of its agencies have limited knowledge of the area or international studies competences of their employees and of future requirements for specialists. However, the situation is not without bright spots, especially in the security-defense sector where several agencies' performances have exceeded the norm, and increasing attention is being given to programs which match job requirements with foreign area or international studies skills.

2. In addition to the imprecision in definitions and the wide diversity among foreign area specialists, USG agencies generally have been complacent because the supply-demand equation for area specialists greatly favors the supply side in gross terms. Little change is foreseen for 5-10 years. But this is a superficial view because it masks the USG's dependence on the academic sources of supply. To a far greater degree than in the case of foreign languages, agencies of the USG depend on colleges and universities not only to produce manpower with area and international studies skills, but also to provide both research and experts for consultation on matters of international significance. In its own in-house training programs, the USG also borrows heavily from academic sources for teachers and materials.

3. It would seem axiomatic, therefore, that the agencies of the USG would have a lively interest in maintaining at least the base of support and supply in colleges and universities. There are some exceptions, but even a superficial examination of the facts shows most agencies of the USG have provided only modest resources--mostly in the form of contracts and HEW Office of Education grants--

to academia. Coordination within the USG of agencies providing support is limited but somewhat better than a year ago. Direct contacts between all but a few government agencies and universities are modest (except in training) compared to the potential benefits both ways. The USG has been taking the colleges and universities for granted.

So far this benign indifference--there is no noteable hostility among government officials to academics--has been justified in part on the basis of the commonly held stereotype view in government that most college professors are traditionally oriented toward their own teaching and research. Being out of touch with the present they could make little contribution to immediate operational problem-solving, which absorbs the pressure laden working hours of most USG officials.

Moreover, from the USG's point of view, colleges, which are driven by student demand more than job-market realities, continue to turn out a surplus of area specialists, including many with advanced degrees. So why worry? Superficially, the current picture argues for indifference in that respect.

4. Over production implies wastage and the facts, though inconclusive, support the assumption. A statistical study of all USG positions in the listing of the Office of Personnel Management shows that only 1 of 3 USG employees at professional level currently on the rolls is using the area specialty--even approximately--in which he or she holds a Bachelor's degree or higher. An examination of the area specialists by their particular specialty shows that only those with degrees in Russian and Slavic Studies approach a 1 in 2 chance of using their skills on a USG job. For African specialists, the chances are only 1 in 6. Thus, many area specialists are employed in the various agencies for reasons other than their main academic preparation.

5. Not only are the working level, professional rolls oversubscribed with area specialists, the civil service "super grades", which covers ranks of GS 15-18, include an abundance of highly qualified professionals in a broad spectrum of disciplines who also have a noteable potential of area expertise. The Office of Personnel Management's Executive Inventory shows 8,000 with expert area skills and 31,000 with very good, but less than expert area competence. All major world areas are well represented. These are self-ratings and can be discounted to a degree, but not ignored. All of these persons are currently on active duty and, presumably, could be used for a wide variety of assignments if needed for contingencies. Equal numbers of retired former USG employees are carried on the Executive Inventory on a current basis and might be available for extended emergencies.

6. The area training programs of the USG departments and agencies are far less uniform in quality and scope and are less well developed than USG language training. However, these are easily correctable deficiencies because the numbers are relatively small and there are good experience bases in the Army, the Air Force, and the Department of State to improve quality and to increase quantity.

On the civilian side, the more critical factors are weak forward planning and limited allocation of resources (positions for trainees and money). For example, the Department of State is training only 8 in-depth area specialists in FY 79 and will increase this to 11 in FY 80. Although these numbers are supplemented by far larger numbers of staff in short-term and orientation-type training normally given in conjunction with language training, they are miniscule compared to the size and depth of USG activities abroad and the State Department's role. They represent token numbers based primarily on budget constraints rather than planning to meet future needs.

Not all agencies are as slow off the mark as State. The Army has a well-established, long range foreign area specialist training program. Intelligence agencies have made recent improvements internally which, in time, will enhance their analytical capabilities by rewarding excellence (with a sabbatical program), encouraging self-improvement (language training), and raising standards.

7. This paper has focussed on the human resource factors in the USG employment of foreign area specialists and has only mentioned the dependence of the USG on research performed for the various agencies by other bodies, primarily universities and consultants. The quantity of "external" research has been relatively in decline (as noted in the data provided to the Rand Corporation and incorporated in its report for the President's Commission). The quality and utility of the research to USG agencies have not been measured systematically and there are no established USG criteria. Impressionistic views, however, show that USG end-user elements are generally satisfied with the results of "external" research, especially the studies done by high quality consultant firms. A few of these firms have several advantages over other consultants and over universities. They have more familiarity with USG operations, more and better contacts, and internal controls which the university cannot match.

The key to further exploitation of academic research by USG agencies is to convince agency managers and key operational officers of the over all give-and-take value of long-term research and frequent consultation, which are the strength of universities and colleges. Clearly, academia is capable of providing more long-term input than is currently in demand from the USG agencies.

8. The central question that escapes answer remains. Is the USG getting the benefits of foreign area and international studies that it needs to perform its functions effectively?

No one knows the answer because, so far, no one has devised a systematic way of measuring either requirements or results. Unavoidably, judgments will continue to be subjective and imprecise. Inter-agency differences add to the confusion.

In this long-standing situation, there are strong and often contradictory motivations toward collective thinking and redundancy, toward consensus and competition as substitutes for precision. The costs are high but there seems no other way.

However, after allowing for a margin of difference, there are still too many area and international specialists available for the next decade and more than 5,000 receive degrees in area and international studies each year. These figures argue strongly in favor of increasing quality and reducing quantity.

9. If supply and demand are out of balance, it follows that there is a need to find mechanisms to restore the equilibrium. Demand for area specialists and international studies could be increased and/or supply of skills and marginal research reduced. Such coordination on research is well developed in the intelligence community. It would be desirable both within the USG foreign affairs community and between government and the private and academic sectors, not only to preserve scarce resources--there being no sign of increase--but to develop contacts and cooperation among them and to indicate priorities or at least a consensus on substantive matters. Since effective coordination ultimately depends on control of resources, the composition of the coordinating body becomes significant. The objective should be to find new or better ways to utilize the nation's intellectual talent.

10. The minimum USG requirement can be stated in institutional terms. The government needs an academic base to help meet its requirements for area specialists and international studies experts. The size of the base need not be set arbitrarily, but should be worked out through competitive factors and market forces stimulated by government resource inputs, which will probably continue to be minority contributions in most cases.

Recommendations

1. The foreign affairs community of the USG should define the terms foreign area specialist and specialist in international studies. Levels of competence should be described and, though a range of variables will be needed, a consensus should be achieved.

2. The agencies of the USG most directly concerned (the foreign affairs community led by State and the Intelligence Community) should organize themselves to improve the coordination of foreign area research grants, consultancies, and contracts. The framework already exists under National Security Council (NSC) directives to re-assault this increasingly vexing problem.

3. A funded, formal mechanism should be established under the sponsorship of the NSC and the annual rotating chairmanship of State, Defense, AID, HEW, and CIA to provide policy interface with the business, foundation, and academic sectors on research allocation for foreign area and international studies, including research and the development of experts.

4. The supporting institutions under the Federal systems (Library of Congress, National Endowment for the Humanities, National Science Foundation, the Smithsonian Institution, etc.) should pool their capabilities to provide the President, the Congress, and the NSC sponsored coordinating group with a biennial report on research and education in the U.S. on foreign areas and international topics. This report would provide the data needed for individual and collective decisions.

ESTIMATED FOREIGN AREA AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES SPECIALISTS
EMPLOYED BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
(Positions)
Spring 1979

AREA	AID	INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION AGENCY	STATE	TOTAL DEFENSE SECURITY AGENCIES	ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY	COMMERCE	ENERGY	FEDERAL RESERVE	HEW
Africa	399	104	197	93					
Asia	199	220	267	602		9		8	
Europe	0	390	697	1156	100	29		26	
East						(4)			
West						(13)			
USSR					(100)	(12)			
Latin America	259	173	329	221				10	
Middle East	162	165	238	211				2	
Other	471	29	430	349		118	50		50
English speaking countries									
Unidentified									

ESTIMATED FOREIGN AREA AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES SPECIALISTS
EMPLOYED BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
(Positions)
Spring 1979

AREA	LABOR	LIBRARY OF CONGRESS	NATIONAL AERONAUTICS & SPACE ADMINISTRATION	PEACE CORPS		TREASURY	AGRICULTURE	EXPORT-IMPORT BANK	INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION
				PCV	US STAFF				
Africa				1613	61		21	2	
Asia	1		2	1035	13	3	11	5	
Europe			4			28	35	10	
East									
West			(2)						
USSR			(2)						
Latin America	8			1585	15		19	5	30
Middle East	1			132	5	8	3	3	
Other				1357	52	11	10		
Unidentified		90							
Oceania				(248)	(6)				
English speaking countries				(1109)	(46)	(11)	(10)		

ESTIMATED FOREIGN AREA AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES SPECIALISTS
EMPLOYED BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
(Positions)
Spring 1979

AREA	INTERIOR	JUSTICE	OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORP.	TRANSPORTATION	GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE	NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL	MISCELLANEOUS AGENCIES	GRAND TOTAL
Africa								2490
Asia	3	37	1					2311
Europe	18	67	7					2517
Latin America	2	115	7					2744
Middle East	1	9						908
Other				85	23	14	8	3081
English speaking countries				(85)	(23)	(14)	(8)	
Unidentified								
						TOTAL		14338

ESTIMATED FOREIGN AREA AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES SPECIALISTS
EMPLOYED BY
THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
(Positions)
Spring 1979

NOTES:

The areas have been used in a broad geographic sense. The Middle East includes South Asia agencies which put South Asia (India) for the civilian agencies in most cases. There are some defense-security agencies which put South Asia into the Asia category.

The "other" category includes area specialists unidentified as to geographic area and international studies specialists (international trade expert, international lawyers, etc.). It also includes Peace Corps Volunteers and Staff assigned to English speaking countries.

The individual agency data and the totals should be used with some caution. Some of the orders of magnitude are agency estimates. Generally, the data contains a conservative bias. The reasons lie in the absence of precision in the USG agencies in defining an area or international specialist and the absence of specific data to describe each position in terms of these specialties. Consequently skills inventories are also rare. Thus, it is not possible to measure correlations between requirements and incumbents' skills in any systematic way. Nevertheless, subjective impressions indicate that the jobs-skills match is very high, not least because employees are hired because of skills or are given specific training or exposure after employment.

THE US GOVERNMENT REQUIREMENTS FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGES

James R. Ruchti, Foreign Service Officer
U.S. Department of State

Overview

Of the 5.5 million total civilian and military positions in the U.S. Government (USG) on 1/1/79, only a small percentage required language competence other than English, 29,000 or about 0.5 percent. Nevertheless, many of these positions are filled by some of the most important contributors to the safety and well-being of the U.S. because they are critical to the communications and information flow between the U.S. and other governments and non-English speaking people domestically. Without foreign language capabilities the USG could not operate effectively in security, diplomatic, and myriad other fronts of direct interest to Americans. Therefore, more than 25 agencies of the USG recruit, employ, and train persons with varying degrees of foreign language proficiency. Numerically the bulk are in the defense-security-intelligence sector. No agency can claim preeminence in terms of linguistic quantity and quality, but the Department of State probably comes closest to that role because of the proportion of its total staff in its overseas complement and the largely external focus of its domestic activities.

The agencies of the USG have problems meeting their language requirements. Overall, there is less a quantitative than a qualitative problem now and for the next few years. Nevertheless, capability in a handful of difficult languages is chronically below needs. The central issue, however, is to maintain an adequate supply base, especially in the education system, so that the USG, as a "consumer", can recruit persons with aptitudes and demonstrated language skills and either use them directly or train them to meet its specialized linguistic needs.

So far the USG has accomplished these tasks because supplies of talent have exceeded demand, but managers and executives are increasingly worried about the future, as they see motivation in languages decline. The immediate reaction is to put more emphasis on in-house training. This device has limits, however, because this kind of training requires the government to pay salaries and student expenses while the employee is away from his or her regular position, in addition to the cost of instruction per se. Thus the battle of priorities and costs is joined. Agencies will be compelled to scramble for additional resources at a time of scarcity or to lower their capability and thus risk weakening their mastery of vital communications and information flows.

There are a number of administrative actions which the USG and its agencies could take which would improve their ability to determine their language needs, to examine available resources, and to increase the supply of linguists. They are cited in the final section entitled Recommendations.

U.S. Government Requirements for Foreign Languages

I. Requirements of the USG for Persons with Foreign Language Skills

1. General Aggregates.

On 1/1/79, there were 29,000 full-time positions in the USG which required competence in a language other than English. There is an additional, but imprecise number of positions for which language skills are a decided advantage. The number of these positions is estimated at 5000. A third category is part-time employees and contract employees using language skills. This group is estimated at 3000.

2. Categories of Positions.

Positions requiring foreign languages can be divided into two broad categories, those using a language for "external" purposes and those with an "internal" purpose. External purposes are those dealing with the world outside the U.S. such as intelligence and foreign language broadcasts. Internal purposes are essentially domestic programs and law enforcement such as census taking and customs collection.

75 percent of USG language positions are "external" in their primary focus.

3. Agency Concentration.

There are two main clusters of "external" positions: the intelligence-security cluster and the civilian-representation cluster. The former includes employees and Servicemen and women in the Department of Defense and its components and the Central Intelligence Agency. This cluster totals about 14,000 positions, most of which are in the uniformed Services of the Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force.

The civilian representation cluster comprises elements of the State, Agriculture, Commerce and Treasury Departments plus the Agency for International Development (AID), the International Communication Agency (ICA), and the Peace Corps. This cluster totals some 6500 language positions.

4. Degrees of Competence.

Of the 29,000 total language positions, 75 percent require a skills level of "minimum professional proficiency", 1/ or the next step lower,

---

1/ Minimum professional proficiency means able to speak-comprehend, read or write with sufficient accuracy and vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics or able to read standard newspapers or reports in his/her special field. In USG parlance this is an S-3/R-3 rating on a scale of 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest).

"limited competence"[2/]. The emphasis is on speaking-comprehending-understanding, followed by reading and writing skills. There are exceptions to this priority listing, depending upon the position. For example, the Library of Congress, a major employer with nearly 900 positions requiring language skills, places highest value on reading for its catalogers, while AID puts almost exclusive weight on speaking for its field representatives abroad.

The positions which require high levels of competence at the "full professional proficiency"[3/] or at the top rung, "native or bilingual proficiency"[4/] are highly concentrated, in the "external" cluster, in intelligence, in radio broadcasting, and in interpreting-translating. These number only about 1500 positions or 7.5 percent of the total cluster.

The "internal cluster" positions at high levels of proficiency total 5500 compared with the lower levels of 2600. The high level of competence requirements comes primarily from the growing numbers of Hispanic peoples in the U.S. Concentrations are in agencies dealing with Spanish-speaking people in Puerto Rico, Florida, and the Southwest such as census-takers in the Department of Commerce or Department of Treasury Internal Revenue Service employees.

5. Jobs-Skills Matching.

The management goals of USG agencies include matching the skills of personnel with the position requirements. In languages this is essential for high-competence positions and has been achieved (not always easily) by setting appropriate standards for recruitment and incumbency for positions in the "external" and "internal" clusters. On the whole, however, most of the "internal" jobs are easily filled--usually by native speakers of Spanish, the most needed language. They apply for jobs near their area of residence. Recruiters have abundant applicants from whom to choose. "External" high-competence is obtained from native speakers and by training/experience abroad.

The matching of jobs and skills for the "external" cluster at the "minimum professional proficiency" level (S-3/R-3 or S-2/R-2) is more difficult. Selection criteria, including education, experience, and security clearances, are tighter. Consequently, a perfect match is not achieved and compliance ranges from less than 50 percent in some intelligence-security positions to somewhat over 70 percent for the major civilian-representation agencies (State, AID, ICA). There are even larger percentage variations in compliance in particular languages, especially those which are difficult for native-born, English-speaking Americans, such as Eastern European and Asian languages.

[2/]Limited competence means able to satisfy routine social demands and limited work requirements or to read simple prose in print on familiar subjects. The numerical rating is S-2/R-2.
[3/]This ranks as S-4/R-4 on a scale of 5.
[4/]This ranks as S-5/R-5 on a scale of 5.

The matching problem is also made more complicated in the "external cluster" by the need to put language skills together with other skills and disciplines in matching person and job. Other skills invariably include the primary discipline of the position. Thus Treasury, Commerce and Agriculture want international economists who also have skills in Japanese, Russian, or Chinese, etc., but the primary requirement is the discipline. Languages can be taught to economists, but linguists may not be acceptable economists.

II. Supply of Linguists

1. Sources.

The USG obtains the services of persons with language skills from four principal sources. For the "internal cluster", three sources apply. They are primarily resident bilinguals, secondly, agency training programs, and finally, some recruits from the education system (colleges and universities).

For the "external cluster", the four sources are in different order. Internal agency training programs are the most important, followed by the education system (colleges and universities) and by resident and non-resident bilinguals. Few college graduates, even with advanced degrees, can satisfy language requirements when they apply for positions. Only one in five candidates who pass the Foreign Service Examination achieves a "3" level rating when tested. This figure holds for college graduates with language majors.

2. Training.

The language training systems of the USG, particularly for "external cluster" positions support the agencies requiring these skills. Language training for agencies concerned with defense and security interests is provided by the Defense Language Institute (DLI), the National Security Agency school in the Department of Defense and the Central Intelligence Agency's language school. For civilian agencies language training is provided by the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) of the Department of State.

The largest of the schools are the DLI which has 4000 (± 10%) students annually, depending on the needs of the military Services[5/], and the FSI

5/ The Army is providing language instruction to 100,000 Servicemen and dependents in a massive effort to improve capability with Allied Forces and to assist Americans serving abroad to live with and understand host country nationals. These commendable projects are not counted in the statistics in this report because most are not directly related to position requirements.

which prepares about 1800 yearly for 28 agencies. The Peace Corps trains volunteers in country of service, thus balancing needs and inputs.

3. Supplemental Resources.

A significant supplementary element to the USG's total resources is the contract employee--a person hired to perform a language task on an as-needed basis. The State Department maintains a file of 1200 persons, on open-ended contracts, who can be used for various jobs (such as escorts/translators, seminar interpreters and conference interpreters).[6/] Contract support is also widely used by the Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) and by the Air Force. They purchase translation work to free full-time employees for other, higher level activity.

There are two additional, potentially valuable contingency resources available to the USG. For the military establishment, the reserve forces of the four services contain 10,000 officers and 16,000 enlisted men with a wide range of language skills, including many rare and difficult languages. In the civilian sector, there is the Executive Inventory which has records of senior civil servants (GS-15 and above) active and retired. This computerized "reservoir" of talent thus overlaps with agencies' currently employed senior officers who usually have top positions, but it is a reserve force nonetheless. The Executive Inventory lists 53,000 names. About half are retired. Over 2000 are fluent speakers and/or readers of one or more Western European languages, and there are smaller numbers who have "hard" languages (Eastern European, Asian and African). The inventory is up-dated annually.

4. Skills Inventories.

A few agencies also maintain a skills inventory which includes language data. To illustrate: among Agriculture's 84,000 employees, there are 10,000 names in 80 languages. Of these 750 rate themselves with native fluency in speaking and 800 in reading competence. Nearly all these employees (95%) are employed in professional categories (GS-9 and above).

The Department of Defense (all Services) has a skills reservoir of over 20,000 officers and enlisted men on active duty. Many are currently employed in language positions, but there is a supplemental margin of 50% above present requirements in most languages. The real value of this talent is debatable if

---

6/Half the 1200 supplemental interpreters/translators are not U.S. citizens. 2/3 are escort interpreters, the lowest level. They are paid on a daily basis ($33 to $90 per day depending on skills and experience but not on the language per se). Only occasionally is there an availability problem. The higher ranking interpreters are at seminar level (from $140 per day) and at Conference level (from $175 per day). They must be simultaneous interpreters. Increasing the pay of interpreters would probably increase availability only marginally and might have a negative effect on their total income by reducing the days they would work. The State Division of Language Services provides linguist support primarily to the civilian components of the USG, not the security-intelligence sectors.

one considers its availability, the problem of the retention of language skills, and the currency of the records which keep track of it. Nevertheless, the military system offers advantages in organizational, mobility, and security clearance terms which should not be overlooked. A long-term problem on retention is caused by rotation of units and persons whose language capabilities are not used much during tours of duty in the U.S.

The Department of State also has a large skills inventory of 8700 Americans in almost all useful languages and dialects. The tested competence levels are higher than most agencies, as would be expected for Foreign Service employees. The skills inventory contains test date and level of competence. There is loss of skills over time but retraining for short periods has proven restorative effects, especially for those with a "3" level rating.

The utility of skills inventories on an agency basis lies in the advantages it gives managers. In addition to making routine in-house assignments, they can use the data to meet language contingencies with their own staff who already know the necessary substance or discipline, normally the primary requirement.

III. Trends

1. Current Sought-After Languages.

The USG employs persons who use 130 languages and dialects. Of these, 41 were of particular interest as of January 1979, either because of the relative scarcity of Americans proficient in the "hard" languages involved or because of the large and on-going demand for the particular language. Examples of the latter are French, German, Italian and Spanish. There is seldom much difficulty in finding competence in these languages so they are not "critical" in the sense of dire and unsatisfied need. Nevertheless, matching other skills or requirements with language competence can complicate the search for talent for an agency with particular needs, such as those in intelligence activities.

2. "Critical" Languages.

Judging by recent experience, current and future needs, and probable on-going scarcity, a handful of languages can be defined as critical. They are in order of priority grouping: Arabic (and dialects), Chinese (and dialects), Russian, Korean, Japanese, Persian (Farsi), and Polish. Of these, the first four rank considerably higher on agencies' lists than the last three.

It is the difficulty of learning these seven languages plus the increasing demand for them in the USG agencies which command attention. Persian (Farsi) is the only relative newcomer to the list. The rest have been on the "critical" lists for more than 5 years.

It goes without saying that many languages could become comets and interest in them would flash brilliantly during a brief, unforeseen crisis period and then subside. Such contingencies are difficult to plan for because languages do not "stockpile" well. This means it is both uneconomical to train too many persons in seldom-used languages and to try to retain competence and the availability of their services when they have little or no useful work to perform in normal circumstances. The "stockpile" requires expensive inputs over extended periods if it is to be maintained. Even then, the skilled persons must be retrieved from it which is seldom easy. Building or holding small reserve capability is the natural tendency. Typical of these languages are Sub-Saharan/ African languages and some Indian tongues in Latin America.

Another option is to give incentives to individuals to learn and retain competence in critical languages. This format has been followed by the Departments of State and Agriculture and by elements of the security-intelligence community. It has received new impetus recently because of Iran. Incentives, mostly monetary rewards, have a mixed performance record. They work effectively for some agencies, especially if the language being promoted is useful beyond a narrow one-country setting. An example is Arabic. However, for many professionals in positions, such as those filled by Foreign Service Officers, a "hard" language of limited utility is perceived to be a handicap to career advancement since it often takes a long time to learn a "hard" language and that language may offer few interesting assignment prospects. Statistical evidence does not confirm this perception in the long term (20 years). Nevertheless, the opinion has been detrimental to recruitment of volunteers for languages such as Burmese, Tamil, Nepali, Mongolian, Sinbala and Amharic.[7/] Other incentives are needed to stimulate learning of these kinds of language.

3. The Future and the Dilemma.

Forward planning in the USG to anticipate future language needs in the "internal cluster" is minimal or non-existent, but it is beginning to receive increased attention in the "external cluster". The military-security elements are more advanced than the civilian representation group primarily because they have more difficulty recruiting and retaining linguists. Their quantitative requirements are larger, the training arduous, and the kinds of duties performed are demanding. In addition there is high attrition among the average recruit on his or her first 3-year enlistment (18% versus 13% for those with 4 or more years of service).

All of the agencies, particularly the heaviest users of language skills, are uneasy about the uncertainties of the future. The most alert among them worry about the decline in language study at schools and colleges as portending a period of reduced availability of good recruits in future years.

The dilemma lies in the apparent contradiction between anticipated dwindling qualities and quantities of linguists on the one hand, and the current abundance of language talent on the job market, on the other. The present abundance discourages the potential linguist, thus further reducing the future supply from the education system.

7/ A commonly heard comment illustrates the attitude: Amharic is a language which isn't spoken below 6000 feet.

The response on the part of Government agencies has been to step up in-house training or to retrain or cross-train already qualified linguists in additional or more critical languages.

IV. The Job Market in the USG

1. Discipline Plus Language.

Recruiters and Personnel officers look for persons who have the necessary academic discipline before they examine an applicant's foreign language skills. Language, though important, as a qualification, is secondary. That statement applies, with a few exceptions such as 1100 interpreters and translators, to all civilian positions in the following departments and agencies: Agriculture, A.I.D., Commerce, Interior, E.I.C.A., Justice, Labor, Peace Corps, State, Treasury, Arms Control and Disarmament, Energy, Export-Import Bank, Federal Reserve Board, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. Consequently, persons seeking positions in these agencies should have prerequisites in basic disciplines (economics, political science, law, business administration, engineering, etc.). If, in addition, they have language skills at least at "limited or minimum professional levels" (rating of 2 or 3, depending on language), they will have an advantage in obtaining a job.

2. Linguists.

Recruiters from those agencies which rely on linguists for essential communications functions have different priorities. The Defense establishment for intelligence and security work, especially in cryptography, and the Voice of America, for foreign language broadcasts, are examples. The Library of Congress also has positions where language is coequal qualification with other disciplines (library science, history, law, etc.). Persons seeking these jobs should have good language aptitude and, in civilian professional positions, high language skills. VOA and Library of Congress employees must have required language skills (at the "4" or "5" level) before they are employed.

The number of job openings annually for linguists, as the primary job requirement, is small for VOA and Library of Congress; i.e., they are not expanding and the turnover rate in these agencies is below the average 9-10 percent for professionals in the USG. There are 522 total language positions at VOA and 890 at the Library of Congress.

Civilian linguist position openings in security and intelligence work depend on security clearances and aptitude plus skills. There are several hundred openings annually, but the number varies considerably from year to year. Extensive in-house training is standard.

Military positions are open for volunteers with language aptitude and skills. The turnover rate in the enlisted ranks is high (18 percent annually). The Services train recruits in necessary languages. Of the 4000 ($\pm$ 10%) annual in-put of students at the Defense Language Institute, over half (2200 in recent years) are recruits. They regularly study 25 languages and dialects.

3. Peace Corps.

Because of the large annual turnover in Peace Corps Volunteers (50 percent) and Peace Corps staff (30 percent), there are more job prospects there than in any other agency. For PCVs (1979 total is 6900) and for staff (750 in 1979), language capability in French only is a recruiting plus, but to be assigned to a country a staff member posted abroad (195 in 1979) must speak the primary language of the host country or the secondary language if the primary language is English.

4. Summary.

Taken together, there are the following estimated openings on an annual basis for persons with language skills.

Discipline plus language group	1635
Linguists, including Translators-Interpreters	430
Military (enlisted)	2200
Peace Corps (staff and Volunteers)	3725
Grand Total	7990
Total without Peace Corps	4265

To these may be added positions where language is an advantage but not a requirement. 500

Annual Grand Total	8500
Annual Grand Total without Peace Corps	4765

V. Observations and Conclusions

1. In balancing USG language requirements against available supplies (from on board skills and readily available reserves), it is apparent in gross aggregate terms that the USG is richly endowed quantitatively for the present. There are more than twice as many (62,000) in actual or potential supply as there are positions (29,000). Furthermore, the supply could be supplemented by several thousand retirees from the Executive Inventory in an emergency. For most agencies in most languages, it remains a buyer's market in linguists in 1979.

2. But even in the face of the good overall present supply picture, there are gaps in meeting USG language requirements. These show up clearly in difficult languages, particularly Arabic, Chinese, Russian, and Korean. Japanese, Polish, and now Persian (Farsi) are in the second tier. All but Farsi have been on the "critical" lists for five or more years. No doubt these languages will pose manning problems for the period ahead because it requires many years to produce a competent linguist in them.

In addition there is less than 100% compliance in filling positions designated as requiring language skills, particularly in "external" cluster agencies. This seems to be contradictory to the supply picture. Further differentiation and illustration help explain away part of the apparent problem. Compliance

figures are usually cited on an agency-wide basis. Therefore, for example, Foreign Service personnel with administrative talent and positions are counted together with substantive officers doing political and economic work. The latter have more incentives and skills in languages. The former have a lower compliance rate. Because the degrees of essentiality of language skills for administrative work is less than for substantive positions, it is easier to waive or reduce the requirement in making assignments. Nevertheless, compliance is still not 100% even for substantive positions alone, as the system demands. This is caused by manipulation of the system and by the relative weight placed on position qualifications over and above language considerations. No doubt the USG would be better served by greater compliance and increased language competence.

3. Training figures by USG agencies (7000 annually excluding the Peace Corps in 1979) show, comparatively, that training is considerably above total turnover rates. This implies an increase in the requirements which is marginally true. But equally importantly, it reflects the USG's experience with proficiency, namely, the need to train linguists in-house because nearly all recruits come with inadequate language skills from the education system. Indeed, in providing data for the survey, personnel managers and training officers routinely expressed a low level of expectation of recruits' language skills unless the newcomers had lived or worked abroad for extended periods or come from bilingual backgrounds.

4. Concerns of managers include the never ending difficulties of matching skills with jobs, finding incentives to induce employees to learn or retain language skills, and learning, themselves, to anticipate future language requirements. With no exceptions, managers in agencies which use languages for "external" purposes are concerned about the levels of competence of employees. This will probably always be true, but external events (Iran) and recent, increased technical capabilities have increased the quantity and shortened the time for analyzing information, thus raising the pressure on linguists to perform at high levels of skill quickly.

5. Looking ahead, the most alert managers and executives are also worried about the reduction in language instruction in the education system. They foresee a continued drop in the flow-through of students and a gradual evaporation of the linguistic pool in the U.S., which was so handsomely replenished by the inflow of persons from abroad after World War II and built up by the great emphasis on languages which was stimulated by the reaction to Sputnik in the late 1950's and the decade of the 1960's. Some of these fears may be exaggerated if one considers the total size of reserves in the U.S. as reflected in the census data and numbers of students earning degrees in languages. Nevertheless, it is apparent that the tight USG job market for linguists now and for the next few years will continue to be a discouraging factor for students seeking positions in Government.

The answer, on an individual basis, clearly lies in combining a discipline with a language, particularly a difficult language. That is the way to gain a distinct advantage in competing for one of the 29,000 USG positions with language requirements.

The answer on a national level, as perceived by managers and executives, is to put more emphasis on in-house training and better use of existing resources (i.e., retraining or up-grading). There are actions along these lines already. However, the cost of training is high when employees' salaries and expenses are added to instruction costs, more than doubling the outlays. The limitation to this option is money.

VI. Recommendations

The following recommendations are minimum actions which the USG and its agencies could adopt, mostly at modest or little cost, to improve their abilities to determine needs, to examine available resources, and to improve the supply of linguists. Most are administrative actions. Several are used by one or more agencies already. None are new or unique.

The recommendations are also designed to stimulate ongoing interest in languages in a general way and to provide incentives to students to add language to their skills as they compete for positions in the USG.

A. Recommendations (Requirements)

1. The USG agencies which have not already done so should review their position descriptions and include language as an attribute of the position by stating the degree of essentiality of language and/or the competence level (in standard terms). The effort should be initiated and monitored by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) for all agencies. The security-intelligence community should establish a liaison to protect its interests but also to assure its full participation and cooperation.

2. The USG should set the goal of 100% compliance for matching assignments with language positions by 1985. Each agency should report its progress to the Congress in connection with its budget hearings before committees.

The OPM should provide the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the President with an annual consolidated report by agency, by language, by competence level, and by estimated shortfall.

B. Recommendations (Supply)

1. There is a long-standing controversy in the public domain over the need for a professional corps of USG interpreters who could handle any language contingency with equanimity and redress the image that Americans are either "arrogant" in their attachment to English or poorly served by their obstinacy in not establishing and using an interpreter corps. It is commonly perceived that Americans are not competitive with foreigners because the language competence of our negotiating team is deficient or non-existent compared to the other side.

No doubt the USG would benefit from increased language competence. It is impossible to have too much. The questions are how much is optimum and what would it cost? Because the range of interests to cover, there should be a functional division of effort to serve the two major complexes, i.e., the civilian representation community (State, Treasury, Commerce, AID, etc.) and the security-

defense-intelligence elements. The former should be called Bureau of Interpreters and attached to the Department of State, but raised to a level equivalent to the Chief of Protocol, thus serving the USG as a whole on a centralized basis. The interpreter and translating services for the security-defense-intelligence establishment should be organized on a decentralized basis with each major component (DOD, Military Service Departments, and CIA) providing for its own needs.

There should be an informal mechanism to provide cooperation, and mutual support where feasible between all major security components and between them and the Bureau of Interpreters.

2. Each agency should devise and maintain a skills inventory suitable for meeting its language needs and supplementing its assignment and training programs. Tested competence and retention of skills, provided by in-service training, should be encouraged and rewarded even though it may not be job-related at the moment.

3. Standard application forms for civilian/USG employment provide information on language and degree of competence. An applicant seeking a position for which a language other than English would be useful (even though not essential) should be given an advantage in the selection process under rules established by OPM.

4. The competence of persons to be assigned to any position requiring language should be tested before they are assigned unless they have previously achieved a standard "4" level of competence or they have achieved the required level for the position and been tested within the preceding 3 years. Employment and assignment records should contain this information and should be available for General Accounting Office (GAO) or other authorized review.

5. The U.S. Census should provide language-specific data which includes language other than English used in households, in employment, and in education.

6. Agency-paid training programs should continue to be job-related, but completion and certification should depend on achieving a desired level of competence rather than completing a number of hours of training.

7. Although it is recognized that the DOD and the Military Services are wrestling with difficult issues which go deeply into manpower and personnel programs, they have made only modest gains in retaining linguists, especially after the first term of service for enlisted personnel. The DOD and the Services should make a vigorous effort on, and dedicate more resources, to cover career development for enlisted linguists. The career patterns and assignments for linguists, including cross-training in related military occupation specialties, should be tailored to enhance the prospects for language improvement or retention.

Recognition, including bonuses and promotion advantages for increasing tested language competence should be extended to all military personnel even though the immediate position they hold does not require that skill. This principle should be applied particularly for those languages which are difficult to learn or are in short supply or where the level of 4-4 is achieved for a learned language.

The DOD should set up a placement service to aid retired military linguists to obtain positions after completing their military service.

In sum, the Services should raise the value they place on recruiting, training, utilizing, and releasing linguists and demonstrate this by showing a career for linguists.

8. The Executive Inventory should be used by the Director of Languages, or in the interim by the Department of State, Division of Language Services, and by the security-intelligence interpreters-translators corps to obtain short-term language competent persons. Their remuneration should be at the same hourly rate of pay as the individuals would earn if reemployed by the USG or the going contract rate, whichever is higher. The earnings from these services should not reduce retirement benefits. OPM should submit legislation, if necessary, to secure this exception.

9. The Department of Education should set up and fund programs to meet chronically short critical language gaps. Students learning these languages should be given low interest scholarship loan advantages with repayment of loans delayed until after employment with the USG in critical languages.

USG agencies using these critical language skills should provide the Department of Education with 3 to 5 year projections of their needs so that USG scholarships can be adjusted to fit requirements.

C. Recommendations (Job-Market)

1. The Department of Labor should provide a much expanded, job-specific publication in its regular series on occupations and careers for persons with language capabilities, both in and outside government to elaborate and improve the inadequate attention now given to these jobs in current publications. The publications should list positions where language is an employment bonus as well as those where it is a requirement.

2. The USG should adopt a standard format for linguists who wish to offer their services to the USG. The forms should be circulated by OPM to agencies known to be seeking language skills.

FOREIGN LANGUAGES
USED BY
THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

LANGUAGE	AGRICULTURE		A.I.D.		COMMERCE		I.C.A.		VOA		INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION		JUSTICE	
	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL
Afrikaans		3					1	2						
Akposso														
Albanian														7
Alsatian		2												
Amharic		2		8				3						
Arabic (All)	3	99	3	25			31	74	40	40				34
Aramaic														
Armenian		3						1					1	1
Bámileke														
Bengali		1		4				5	10	10				
Berber		2												
Bulgarian		6					1	10	11	11				3
Burmese							3	12	9	9			1	1
Cambodian		1						5	9	9				
Chamorru														
Catalan														
Chichewa														
Chinese (All)	5	90	2				5	57	44	44			5	104
Chokwe		2												
Creole (Seychelles)														
Czech		35					1	11	18	18				21
Danish		46					4	10					2	6
Duala		7												
Dutch	3	46			1	1	2	11						2
Estonian		2							7	7				
Ewondo (Yaunde)		4												

FOREIGN LANGUAGES
USED BY
THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

LANGUAGE	LABOR		LIBRARY OF CONGRESS		PEACE CORPS		STATE		TREASURY		DEFENSE-SECURITY		TOTALS	
	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL
Afrikaans			2	2			1	15			4		8	22
Akposso											3		3	
Albanian								1			7	4	7	13
Alsatian												2		2
Amharic			1	1			1	14			7	5	9	37
Arabic (All)	1		23	23	101	101	46	173			543	536	793	1,127
Aramaic			3	3									3	3
Armenian			5	5									6	10
Bamileke								1						1
Bengali			2	2			2	9			1	2	14	31
Berber												1		3
Bulgarian			6	6			4	32			53	20	75	88
Burmese			1	1			3	27			5	2	22	50
Cambodian								8			10	7	19	30
Chamorru												9		9
Catalan														
Chichewa					12	12							12	12
Chinese (All)		3	41	41			27	170			573	419	702	928
Chokwe														2
Creole (Seychelles)					1	1							1	1
Czech			16	16			9	54			340	45	384	199
Danish			4	4			4	40			15	40	29	145
Duala														7
Dutch			13	13			9	78	1	1	34	67	62	218
Estonian			10	10									17	25
Ewondo (Yaunde)												2		6

FOREIGN LANGUAGES
USED BY
THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

LANGUAGE	AGRICULTURE		A.I.D.		COMMERCE		I.C.A.		VOA		INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION		JUSTICE	
	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL
Fanagalo		3												
Fante		2												
Fijan														
Finnish		21					4	11						2
Flemish		12												
Formosan														
French	21	2,595	353	530	6	6	72	495	19	19	3	3	38	113
Fulani/Fula		1												
Gaelic		5												
Gaiia		22												
Georgian		1							8	8				
German	11	3,653			4	4	33	220	4	4			19	66
Gilbertese														
Greek		17					6	34	6	6				27
Guarani		6												
Gujarati														
Haitian (Creole)		3		4				1	6	6				2
Hausa		4		1					8	8				
Hebrew		22					4	7						10
Hindi		23		12				30	8	8				
Hungarian		23					2	14	18	18				21
Ibo				1										
Icelandic		3						1						
Ilocano		34		3										
Indonesian		4	40	36			8	45	19	19			2	
Inoic														
Italian (All)	6	503		42	2	2	14	98					7	88

225

226

FOREIGN LANGUAGES
USED BY
THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

LANGUAGE	LABOR		LIBRARY OF CONGRESS		PEACE CORPS		STATE		TREASURY		DEFENSE-SECURITY		TOTALS	
	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL
Fanagalo								1						4
Fante														2
Fijan					122	122							122	122
Finnish			7	7			3	30			14	29	28	100
Flemish								1			13		13	13
Formosan											2	2	2	2
French		36	417	417	1,279	1,279	260	2,423	15	15	421	2,890	2,889	10,845
Fulani/Fula														1
Gaelic														5
Galla														22
Georgian													8	9
German		11	303	303			117	1,171	7	7	1,784	2,802	2,275	8,241
Gilbertese					6	6							6	6
Greek		3	12	12			16	103			93	163	138	365
Guarani					135	135							135	141
Gujarati			2	2									8	9
Haitian (Creole)								5					6	21
Hausa													8	13
Hebrew		1	22	22			4	41	1	1	97	86	127	190
Hindi			9	9			2	30			3	15	22	121
Hungarian			16	16			7	39			45	79	88	210
Ibo														1
Icelandic							1				3		4	4
Ilocano								3				6		47
Indonesian			4	4			11	86	1	1	30	40	114	234
Inoic											1		1	
Italian (All)			91	91			56	508	5	5	256	488	432	1,821

FOREIGN LANGUAGES
USED BY
THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

LANGUAGE	AGRICULTURE		A.I.D.		COMMERCE		I.C.A.		VOA		INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION		JUSTICE	
	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL
Japanese	6	291			3	3	11	81					7	17
Kannada		3												
Kashmiri		1												
Kazakh		1												
Kirundi														
Korean		45					9	22	9	9			1	3
Krio		1		4										
Kurdish		1												
Laotian		1						13	10	10			1	1
Latin														
Latvian									8	8				2
Lettish		14												
Lingala				1										
Lithuanian		18						2	8	8				5
Lomongo														
Lunda														
Malagasy								9						
Malay		6		5			1	8						2
Maltese														
Mandingo				1										
Marathi														
Mongolian														1
More		1												
Nepalese		1	1	14				2						
Norwegian		49					3	10					1	12
Nubian		2												
Nyanja		8		3										

229

230

FOREIGN LANGUAGES USED BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

LANGUAGE	LABOR		LIBRARY OF CONGRESS		PEACE CORPS		STATE		TREASURY		DEFENSE-SECURITY		TOTALS	
	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL
Japanese	1	1	39	39			20	126	2	2	167	244	254	763
Kannada												3		6
Kashmiri														1
Kazakh														1
Kirundi														2
Korean			13	13	181	181	6	41			714	167	933	481
Krio														5
Kurdish												1		2
Laotian							2	14				3	13	42
Latin			4	4									4	4
Latvian			19	19									27	40
Lettish														14
Lingala								1				6		8
Lithuanian			22	22								18	30	73
Lomongo												1		1
Lunda											1		1	
Malagasy														9
Malay			1	1	218	218	2	14			4	16	226	270
Maltese														2
Mandingo														2
Marathi								1				9		10
Mongolian								1				2		4
More														1
Nepalese					124	124	1	14					126	155
Norwegian			6	6			6	56			21	52	37	173
Nubian														2
Nyanja														11

FOREIGN LANGUAGES
USED BY
THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

LANGUAGE	AGRICULTURE		A.I.D.		COMMERCE		I.C.A.		VOA		INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION		JUSTICE	
	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL
Okinawan		3												
Persian (Afghan)			3	9			2							
Persian (Farsi)		9		11			7	27	7	7			3	3
Pidgin														
Polish	2	42	2				7	41	19	19				11
Portuguese (All)	6	191	11	104			32	146	27	27			2	23
Punjabi		19		5										
Pushtu/Pashto		24												
Quechua		1												
Romanian		5					5	30	12	12				22
Russian	5	299			14	14	12	82	58	58				104
Ruthenian														1
Samoan														
Sango		2												
Sanskrit														
Serbo-Croatian	2	22					12	58	12	12				33
Shan														
Singhalese		1												
Siswati														
Slavic								2						
Slovak		17												3
Slovenian		17						4	3	3				
Somali		1												
Sotho/Sesuto		1												
Spanish (All)	19	1,498	267	595	361	361	112	425	29	29	35	35	2,547	3,227
Sudanese														
Sukuma														
Susu		1						1						
Swahili		7	1	8			1	9	4	4				3
Swedish		104					3	21						2

233

234

FOREIGN LANGUAGES
USED BY
THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

LANGUAGE	LABOR		LIBRARY OF CONGRESS		PEACE CORPS		STATE		TREASURY		DEFENSE-SECURITY		TOTALS	
	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL
Okinawan														3
Persian (Afghan)					36	36	3	15			4		48	60
Persian (Farsi)			4	4			16	79			96	49	133	189
Pidgin					26	26							26	26
Polish			38	38			21	115			255	182	344	410
Portuguese (All)			61	61	105	105	67	363	3	3	121	169	436	1,196
Punjabi			5	5									5	29
Pushtu/Pashto			1	1									1	25
Quechua														1
Romanian			7	7			10	59			68	65	102	201
Russian		7	232	232			43	354			4,576	2,039	4,943	3,206
Ruthenian														1
Samoan					68	68						6	68	74
Sango														2
Sanskrit			2	2							35		37	2
Serbo-Croatian			21	21			18	139			76	69	141	346
Shan											2	2	2	2
Singhalese			1	1				6					1	8
Siswati					77	77							77	77
Slavic							1	3					1	5
Slovak			22	22				1				22	22	65
Slovenian			19	19									22	53
Somali											4	4	4	5
Sotho/Sesuto					82	82		3			3	34	85	117
Spanish (All)	67	67	290	290	1,348	1,348	370	1,799	1,980	1,980	1,647	1,647	9,072	27,895
Sudanese														
Sukuma								1						2
Susu														2
Swahili			3	3	235	235	3	46				6	247	321
Swedish			16	16			4	57			19	44	42	243

235

FOREIGN LANGUAGES
USED BY
THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

LANGUAGE	AGRICULTURE		A.I.D.		COMMERCE		I.C.A.		VOA		INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION		JUSTICE	
	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL
Tadjik														
Tagalog		17		9			3	3						
Tamachik														
Tamil		1		1										
Telugu		3												
Thai		5	6	36			6	55	6	6			19	22
Tigumya		2												
Tongan														
Tswa		1												
Tswana				2										
Tuareg														
Turkish		18		15			10	29	5	5			6	10
Twi														
Ukranian		33						1	24	24				
Urdu		10	1	8				16	8	8				
Uzbek									7	7				
Vai														
Vietnamese (All)		59						70	14	14			1	4
Visayan		14						1						
Walamo														
Wolof				2										
Yaunde														
Yoruba														
Yiddish														1
Zulu														

FOREIGN LANGUAGES
USED BY
THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

LANGUAGE	LABOR		LIBRARY OF CONGRESS		PEACE CORPS		STATE		TREASURY		DEFENSE-SECURITY		TOTALS	
	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL	REQ.	SKILL
Tadjik														
Tagalog					330	330	1	9			6	65	340	433
Tamachik														
Tamil								7				2		11
Telugu														3
Thai			4	4	169	169	11	78			31	35	252	408
Tigumya														2
Tongan					62	62							62	62
Tswa											2		2	1
Tswana								1						3
Taureg														
Turkish			9	9			27	48			128	83	185	207
Twi								1						1
Ukranian			20	20				3				30	44	111
Urdu			3	3			5	43					5	72
Uzbek													7	7
Vai												1		1
Vietnamese (All)			6	6				165			135	400	156	712
Visayan								1				1		17
Walamo												1		1
Wolof														2
Yaunde														
Yoruba														
Yiddish			7										7	8
Zulu														
											GRAND TOTAL:		27,164	30,729

NOTES

REQ means required language for a position in the agency. These are positions listed by agencies. They do not include positions for which a foreign language is a desirable, but unrecorded, skill. The range of disciplines and levels of competence are great.

SK means skills available in the agency. Where REQ and SK are identical, the agency has the skills for the position, but does not have a skills inventory of languages.

REQ and SK for the civilian agencies can be used with greater confidence than for the Defense-Security agencies. SK for civilian agencies is substantially understated for the following agencies: Commerce, VOA, Library of Congress, Peace Corps, and Treasury.

REQ and SK for the Defense-Security agencies are only approximate. Civilian employees of the military departments are omitted and data on uniformed personnel currently on active duty is not necessarily included in SK. For example, to compare REQ and SK for Czech would produce an erroneous impression.

REQ and SK for the Peace Corps omits the secondary language requirements for PC staff and volunteers. These comprise many local dialects and more than 50 languages.

TOTALS: REQ and SK may be compared in aggregate form only with caution. The principal reasons are the incompleteness of data and the non-interchangeability of persons between and within agencies. For example a Chinese census-taker for Commerce is not readily available to perform a diplomatic duty for the State Department in Malaysia or a Justice Department court interpreter (Spanish) has a far different competence level than a border patrolman in the same agency.

GRAND TOTALS do not show the number of language positions precisely because breakdowns by language are not available for all agencies. There are an additional 4,000 positions requiring foreign language, making a total of nearly 31,000.

BACKGROUND ON THE FULBRIGHT GRANTEE SURVEY CONDUCTED BY THE FULBRIGHT ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

Barbara B. Burn, Executive Director
President's Commission on Foreign Language and
International Studies

Senator Fulbright's phrase, "the cultivation of international perception and perspective," remains a goal of the program of international educational exchange. The program also attempts to meet the need stated several years ago by former Assistant Secretary of State for Education and Cultural Affairs John Richardson, Jr., to "increase the circle of those able to serve as influential interpreters between America and other countries." But for over a decade the Fulbright Program has suffered from declining financial support by the federal government, close to 60 percent in constant dollars, and has therefore shrunk in its scope and impact. The case for the program apparently needs to be made yet more persuasively. It is hoped that the survey of the experience of Fulbright grantees conducted by the Fulbright Alumni Association which is discussed in Arthur Dudden's paper in this volume will help in strengthening that case.

Although the White House Executive Order which established the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies did not explicitly mandate it to focus on exchanges, at the Commission's first meeting October 26-27, 1978, it decided that international educational exchanges should be one of its several priorities because of the contribution they make to foreign language and international studies. Within one month of that meeting Commission staff entered into discussion with the Fulbright Alumni Association, leading to the survey by that body.

The interest of the President's Commission was to obtain extensive quantifiable data on the contribution of the Fulbright experience to the personal and professional lives of former grantees, including their foreign language proficiency and post-Fulbright involvement in a variety of international education activities. It was thought that such a survey might help to strengthen the case for more support of the Fulbright Program and wider understanding of it. While numerous and useful assessments of the program have been conducted over the years, the recent establishment of the Fulbright Alumni Association made possible the support of a network of persons committed to the program in carrying out a survey.

Because the staff and financial resources of the President's Commission and of the Alumni Association were limited, assistance was sought and found from a number of sources to carry out the survey. Professor Arthur Dudden of Bryn Mawr College, President of the Association, orchestrated the total endeavor, enlisting the help among others of the Association's legal counsel, Michael H. Cardozo IV, and of Jane Kronick, Professor of Social Work and Social Research at Bryn Mawr College -- and a former Fulbrighter and Association member. The U.S. International Communication Agency provided the expertise of Dennis Gombert, from its research staff, and also assisted by hosting several meetings at which USICA staff provided helpful advice on the survey. Georgetown

University, whose President, the Rev. Timothy Healy, S.J., was a member of the President's Commission, assisted by making available to the Commission a doctoral student in computational linguistics, Leonard Shaefer. Georgetown also provided access to its computer facilities. Robert Suggs of Lawrence Johnson and Associates gave generously of his experience during the formulation of the survey form. Staff members from the Board of Foreign Scholarships and the Council for International Exchange of Scholars were also helpful. Finally, a small grant from the Exxon Education Foundation helped to defray some of the basic administrative costs of the survey.

As is suggested in Arthur Dudden's paper, a survey of the Fulbright experience since its inception risks comparing apples and oranges -- and pears. Fulbrighters of the 1950's faced different circumstances than those of the 1960's or 1970's. The fact that of the 3,124 respondents to the survey around one-half held Fulbrights before the drastic funding reductions in the program of 1968 must be taken into account in formulating generalizations. Former grantees' views of their experience are doubtless different if they held Fulbright awards in the early days of the program when the numbers going as lecturers and researchers were roughly equal and only 50 some countries were involved, than more recently when lecturers outnumbered scholars two to one and up to 130 countries have been involved. Grantees' views of the adequacy of their financial support must also be expected to vary with the level of support provided: in earlier years, it was not unusual to receive full funding while abroad; more recently, the Fulbright support for Senior Scholars has so diminished that a scholar's grant is only one part of the total support required, almost having become an "add-on."

Generalizations are further complicated by the fact that, in contrast to the early years of the Fulbright Program when more emphasis was placed on free scholarly research, the Program has in the last decade moved much farther to meet the specific needs, particularly in teaching, of the host countries; in developing countries, it has come to resemble closely programs administered by the Agency for International Development. In a real sense, therefore, the Fulbright Program, especially at the Senior Scholar level, has evolved from one kind of program at its inception to a quite different one, as Professor Dudden implies. A detailed survey of grantees' reactions of its impact upon their lives will therefore need to correlate their responses with the time period involved, with the category of the grant, whether as student, teacher, lecturer, or researcher and with the geographic region of the country in which the grantee was located.

Dudden presents a profile of the Fulbrighters who responded to the Alumni Association questionnaire, and sets forth certain highlights drawn from these responses. The more detailed and systematic analysis of the survey planned by the Fulbright Alumni Association in the future promises to be provocative and informative. The following remarks, based on the various findings of the survey focus on the contribution of the Fulbright experience to the cosmopolitanism of former grantees.

Some 80% of grantees formed permanent friendships abroad, while 70% have since their grant visited friends abroad, changed their "world view," or assisted foreign nationals in their area. Former grantees' sustained commitment

to international involvement is further reflected in the fact that 54% are members of local groups involved in foreign affairs education, over 40% assist Fulbrighters in their area, nearly 20% have served as foreign student adviser at their institutions, and 12.5% as Fulbright adviser. Former Fulbrighters are evidently concerned to keep in their own lives and share with others the kind of cross-cultural experience which is so central to the Fulbright experience.

Of particular relevance to the President's Commission is the foreign-language proficiency evidenced by former Fulbright grantees --and by their spouses and children. Of Fulbrighters in countries requiring foreign language proficiency, 43% characterized their reading ability at the end of their period abroad as 'very good', and 20% as 'good'. Some 36% claimed 'very good' speaking proficiency, 23% 'good'. Those presently having 'very good' speaking proficiency count only 29%, but with 'very good' reading proficiency the figure remains at 38%. Some 39% of spouses, and 33% of children, learned the language of the host country 'some', 24 and 36% respectively, 'a great deal'. That over 50% of spouses and children have retained some fluency (25% of them 'a great deal') suggests the contribution that living abroad makes to language learning and retention and especially to motivation for language study. Most significant is the affirmation by half of those responding to the questionnaire that foreign language proficiency should be required of grantees going to a foreign country.

The preliminary results of the Fulbright Alumni Association survey suggest that at least those responding live their lives with more concern for world affairs, for foreign visitors, and for continued contact through travel and other means with other countries. They are not only a force for international education in American society, but are active in the international community of scholarship. The Fulbright Alumni Association is to be commended for giving more visibility and encouragement to these aspects of the Fulbright Program.

THE FULBRIGHT ALUMNI ASSOCIATION'S 1979 SURVEY

Arthur P. Dudden, President
Fulbright Alumni Association

The Fulbright Alumni Association distributed a questionnaire during the spring months of 1979 to some five thousand former American Fulbrighters to inquire about their experiences in foreign countries as students, teachers, researchers, or artists, as well as their perceptions of the eventual impacts on their lives, families, and careers.

The Association's Questionnaire had two major purposes.

First, the Association wanted to gather information, in keeping with its basic purposes, to utilize the experiences of participants in the Fulbright program, and, further, to strengthen international exchanges among all nations by encouraging and facilitating relationships among previous participants. It sought a record of human experiences compiled from as many former Fulbright grantees who could be contacted, and were willing to take the little time and trouble necessary to be helpful.

Second, the Association intended to transmit the data once assembled without identification of individual respondents, to the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies (operating under Executive Order 12054, April 21, 1978), in order to assist the fact-finding functions of this public body. The President had initially charged the Commission with preparing recommendations inter alia "to assess the need in the United States for foreign language and area specialists, ways in which foreign language and international studies contribute to meeting these needs, and the job market for individuals with these skills," and "what foreign language and area studies programs are appropriate at all academic levels...." The Commission was also to recommend on the resources and legislation required to accomplish the needs it identified.

The Fulbright Alumni Association survey was the cooperative product of a number of individuals and organizations, as pointed out in Barbara B. Burn's introduction to this essay. The questionnaire was addressed to individual Fulbrighters under nine separate headings: 1) Vital statistics; 2) Background Information on Your Fulbright Grant; 3) Your Fulbright Experience; 4) Career Impact of Your Fulbright Experience; 5) Activities After Your Fulbright Tour; 6) Personal Impact; 7) Impact of Family Participation; 8) Foreign Language Proficiency; and 9) Operational Features (as perceived) of the Fulbright Program. Within these categories our inquiring took place, and the data assembled itself.

A gratifying number of 3,117 Fulbrighters completed the questionnaire, a return of well over 60% even allowing for those questionnaires which were undeliverable due to a deceased addressee or an outdated address. The data amassed constitute by far the largest body of information ever supplied by past Fulbrighters about themselves. Great care would have to be taken both to extract its promise while safeguarding the Survey's original purposes.

The Association's project coordinator, Varney Truscott, checked each questionnaire thoroughly. Numerous respondents had attached their comments, suggestions, or complaints on a variety of matters.

Questionnaires filled in and returned by seventeen non-Fulbrighters inadvertently sampled were removed from final consideration, as were fifty-one foreign grantees whose Fulbrights had brought them to the United States, and twelve who chose to return comments only without replying to the interrogations. As one abstainer wrote: "I have decided after some consideration not to fill out the questionnaire which you sent me about the Fulbright experience. That experience was valuable to me, and I consider the program an important one, which should be preserved and extended. But I finally have no faith in the value of 'statistical aggregates or interpretative summaries' in this case." His reservation served to heighten the Association's own precautions in interpreting its statistics.

Names and addresses had to be deleted next from each questionnaire to protect individual respondent's personal privacy, with serial numbers affixed instead for the Association's record-keeping purposes. One hundred ninety individuals, however, had simplified our procedures for us, submitting anonymous responses by simply removing the name-and-address label.

Photocopies of the processed questionnaires, in binders of two hundred each, were thereupon transmitted to the President's Commission. No names of individual respondents were handed over to the Commission, only serially numbered copies whose personal origins are known solely to the Association. No records of responses that identify individuals will enter into or be maintained in government files. All completed questionnaires will be retained by the Fulbright Alumni Association to further its continuing efforts to assess the results of the Fulbright program and to promote international educational and cultural exchanges.

Leonard A. Shaefer, Georgetown University Fellow for Computational Linguistics and Intern with the President's Commission, directed the programming, encoding, and data-processing. He was closely advised by the highly experienced Dr. Dennis Gombert of the International Communication Agency. Shaefer determined that there was "sufficient breadth" on seven of the completed questionnaires detailing the results of multiple grants held by the same individuals to split their responses and count them twice. The 3,117 individuals thereby became 3,124 case studies in the totals assayed.

Two provisions must be considered before proceeding. First, the data the Association has gathered on Fulbrighters come solely from those men and women who answered and returned our questionnaires in the Spring of 1979, a group which, though large and self-revealing beyond all others yet reached, cannot be described accurately as a scientifically designed sample to represent all of the 42,000 or more Fulbrighters, sent since 1947 from the United States to one hundred and thirty-two different countries. Second, no fewer than 82% of our respondents describe themselves as presently employed in higher education, which proportion may or may not be significantly skewed away from the range of occupations truly being held by former Fulbright grantees. It is essential at

the outset to advertise our doubts that our data, however substantial, are representative or even typical. Our figures, it seems clear, are merely the best and biggest ever put together.

As such they must be examined with great care and imagination. We promise you that they will be.

This promise reflects the aims of the Fulbright Alumni Association, as defined in the Wingspread Declaration of the Board of Directors (1979), that is, "to mobilize the experienced wisdom of students, teachers, scholars, artists, men and women in business and government service, and others, who have themselves benefitted from the Fulbright and similar exchange activities, to contribute through their interaction to resolving the awesome problems confronting mankind by stimulating fresh ideas, new analyses, constructive proposals, and cooperative initiatives."

Immediately the tabulations percentages produced by computer presented a number of possibilities for evaluating the Fulbright program, beginning with the so-called Vital Statistics elicited from our Fulbrighters: gender, age, country of birth, education, marital status, and employment classification. It would appear, at first glance, that females have been inequitably represented in the Fulbright program, to a troubling degree. Women, at least among our respondents, have received fewer than 18% of the awards, though this gender ration shows some improvement in recent years. (It will be necessary to measure these figures against those for applications before drawing conclusions). More surprising, perhaps, is to discover how many among the respondent grantees were naturalized U.S. citizens, the number of non-native-born grantees. Approximately one out of every nine American Fulbrighters were not born in this country, many of these, moreover, won grants to return to their country of birth. This seems to be a clear indication of the upward mobility implicit in education's promise, a veritable immigrant success story in itself. How many native-born Americans have taken Fulbright grants to lands of their own ancestral origin, perhaps due either to a submerged nostalgia or a frank curiosity, lies enticingly beyond the data at hand; however, it may be discerned by subsequent investigations.

The range of ages linking our respondents from youthful apprenticeship to elderly retirement, from eighteen years to eighty-nine, is another item of interest. Since the survey question on age was generally understood as 'current age', it is necessary to compute the 'age at time of grant' and correlate the age given with the year of the grant to determine any Fulbrighter's age at that time. It seems evident, nevertheless, that full academic maturity is not indispensible to successful accomplishment: one can only regard with astonishment and admiration (and, possibly, a touch of envy) the youngest, a female Fulbrighter, who at age eighteen is already safely home from her Fulbright to Spain, has her Doctor's degree, and is a Full Professor at a state university with four articles published in foreign journals. Whatever life still holds in store for this remarkable woman our data cannot reveal, but continuing contact will.

The Background Information for each individual sought under the next heading began with the year and country of grant, or 'years and countries', if more than one Fulbright had been awarded, as was true of 22% of the

responding cases. A request followed for the category of grant (or grants) received: student, lecturer, research, teacher, travel only or any miscellaneous designation. First grants alone among our respondents fell 43% to lecturers, 21% each to students and researchers, with 5% each for school teachers and winners of travel-only stipends. Also asked of the respondents (albeit in somewhat lame fashion) was their sponsoring agency, whether the Board of Foreign Scholarships or the Office of Education. Surprisingly, a full third of the respondents proved unable to identify the sponsoring agency. Meanwhile, 60% said a foreign language had not been required of them, but a revealing 66% subsequently felt that it was important to their goals in their host country, and 46% argued that a foreign language proficiency should be required of Fulbrighters in any non-English speaking society. Our respondents listed grants to 109 countries (out of today's high possibility of 132) but this coverage, though broad, was not well-dispersed: fully half of the grants among respondents were to the countries of Western Europe, while the rest of the world together could claim less than 50%.

To discern a "typical" Fulbrighter became fairly easy, as the President's Commission's computer specialist, Leonard Shaefer, pointed out, owing to the relatively sociological homogeneity of the survey respondents. It was equally simple at the same time to appreciate the biases favoring or disfavoring entire ranges of grantees and, hence, their expected reactions.

The statistically prominent respondent recovered by our inquiry, though perhaps internally inconsistent, is male, today about fifty years of age, and the holder of a Ph.D. degree. He was single during his Fulbright term abroad, but now is married, with two children, and works in higher education on a university faculty with the rank of full professor in the humanities.

His sole Fulbright was most likely awarded by the Board of Foreign Scholarships within the past five years to send him as a lecturer to Germany, France, Italy, or England. He returned to his prior university teaching position upon completing his Fulbright, then published a book and/or several articles, both at home and in his host country. Reflecting on his experience, he finds his Fulbright to have been generally beneficial, especially in enhancing his professional standing while broadening his academic and personal perspectives in ways uniquely attributable to the time spent abroad.

This positive verdict on his Fulbright experience also manifests itself in continuing involvements with issues, organizations, and contracts first encountered during the period of the Fulbright grant. Typically, such involvements occur within the institution of the university dealing with international students and scholars, or within the administrative structures of programs for international education.

The most evident form of personal impact made by the Fulbright upon the typical grantee occurs in the establishment and maintenance of friendships, often both personal and professional, with people in the host country. Less evident, but still worth mentioning, are more subtle and long-term subsidiary effects: changes in professional goals and interests, changes in perception

of the world community, and in central values by which domestic life is organized. On languages, there is evidence of our typical Fulbrighter's effort to sustain competencies either developed or enhanced during his tour abroad.

With reference to the structure and administration of the Fulbright program itself, the typical Fulbrighter advocates better preparation before departure, to include some assurance of competency in the host-country language and orientation for the entire undertaking. The program itself is considered to be adequately managed. Stipends are affirmed to be adequate, although latter-day grantees are not as ready to say so as those in earlier granting periods.

The introduction of "filtered frequency tabulations" at this stage of the evaluation process supplied a statistical device, which was especially useful in those numerous instances of particular questions which did not pertain equally to all individuals, as in the instance of inquiries concerning the Fulbright experience and its personal impacts on careers and families.

Question 23, for example, seeks to learn if any material was published resulting from an individual's Fulbright, and where, if the answer is affirmative, it was published. With the 'non-applicable' or missing answers removed from consideration, we learn that no fewer than 78% of the Fulbrighter respondents have published in the United States materials arising out of their Fulbright experience. More surprising perhaps, 50% have published in their host country, while 16%, with an overlap likely in the totals, published in still another country. These figues strongly suggest that the Fulbright exchange experience has created a major foundation for cross-cultural fertilization in ideas, experiences, and research.

Other figures provide additional encouragement for the Fulbright program's apologists. Question 27, addressed to teachers, asks how much they have used materials and/or methods derived from their exchange experience. 36% checked the box marked a "Great Deal" of materials or methods employed and another 40% signified "Some," an extraordinary 76% together. Thus in teacher exchange, we again have positive evidence in favor of the Fulbright experience. Turning to the business sector might seem less promising, but not so. While only 639 individuals, for example, found Question 28 applicable to themselves (it asked for an estimation of the importance of the Fulbright experience for assisting their subsequent careers in business) 44% conceded it to have been of "some" help and 27% avowed it was a "great deal" of help, a positive aggregate of no less than 71% of the respondents for whom this query was applicable, whose business or corporate careers improved more than might otherwise have been expected, owing, as they perceive it, to their Fulbrights.

As for the battery of questions on foreign language proficiency, it suffices at this point to affirm that we have uncovered in our statistics of former Fulbrighters, more than in any other identifiable groupings, the hard-core clusters of Americans proficient enough to teach and communicate to others the languages and literatures of the world's peoples. And beyond the Fulbrighters themselves, there are their spouses, children, and students whose foreign language skills represent still more ancillary benefits of the grantees' acquisitions.

But all was not perfect or uncomplicated. As much as our tabulations, the scores and scores of often lengthy comments from Fulbrighters appended in letters or marginally inscribed on the questionnaires themselves afford a valuable source for evaluating the exchange programs. Confessional accounts of culture shock over novel, confusing or squalid conditions, language barriers, costs of living, localized anti-Americanism, professional slights, and harsh political realities testify eloquently to the generally protective nature of the American environment, the foreignness of the world outside it, and the chronic need for tough-minded orientation to cope with it. The scholar who still feels of his Fulbright tour that, as he wrote, "I was a threat to the establishment," needs to be taken seriously for the benefit of those yet to come. So also does the one-time Fulbrighter whose two subsequent applications, he believes, were both rejected not for academic but for political motivations, and not in the potential host countries but in Washington.

Finally, we come to the future possibilities for most effectively utilizing the substantial array of data, which exists both on magnetic tape and on the completed questionnaires. To assure that there will be proper protection of the data, yet to maintain its accessibility for research use by scholars and policy makers, the Fulbright Alumni Association has copyrighted the information obtained by its 1979 Survey of American Fulbrighters. Arrangements for the data's use must be made through the Association. The following legend composed by the Association's legal counsel, Michael H. Cardozo, IV, must be reproduced in whole or in part in any publication quoting or using the data:

> These data are the result of a survey planned, directed and administered by the Fulbright Alumni Association, in collaboration with the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies and the Office of Education and Cultural Affairs of the International Communication Agency, with financial support furnished to the Association by the Exxon Education Foundation; the programming was performed by Leonard A. Shaefer of the President's Commission, and the necessary computer services were made available by Georgetown University.

The Association's hope and expectation are that our pioneering 1979 Survey will contribute a quantitative groundwork for strengthening and enhancing the Fulbright and similar programs of international educational and cultural exchange. Even the initial results of the Survey more than confirm the widespread conviction that the Fulbright program has been a valuable national resource. Longitudinal and cross-sectional studies, we believe, will demonstrate that it is even more precious than we have realized. The Fulbright Alumni Association intends to spread the good news.

CITIZEN EDUCATION IN WORLD AFFAIRS

Carol Edler Baumann
Commission Member

The need and rationale for more extensive and intensive programs of citizen education in world affairs have long been recognized and attested to by international studies specialists, by international education organizations and agencies, and by the relevant research and literature. As in all five of the areas of concern which the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies will address,[1] the fact that the U.S. public woefully lacks an even rudimentary base of knowledge and understanding of international affairs is not disputed. The purpose of this brief paper, therefore, will not be to recapitulate the seriousness of "the problem," but rather to attempt to relate that problem of citizen education in international affairs to the other problem areas to be considered and to advance some tentative strategies aimed at its amelioration, if not solution.

There are few who would question the advisability of focusing on the educational system of this country--primary and secondary, college and university, undergraduate and graduate--as the principal resource base and in-place institutions for educating our youth and future citizens in the realities of international interdependence (which in turn mandate education in foreign languages, international studies broadly defined, area studies, and global functional issues). Although such an approach, if successful, will help to meet the needs of the future, by itself it does not deal with the equally urgent needs of the present. At a time when the crucial current issues of U.S. foreign policy require an informed American public, we do not have the luxury of time to wait for another generation to become educated about these issues.

In a 1950's study on citizen education in world affairs initiated by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the authors point to three reasons why

> "...the education of adults in this field is at least as important as the education of young people. First, full comprehension of international relations requires an adult mind and adult experience; those who study the subject in youth can lay only a groundwork for more precise and discerning study later on. Second, the problems of foreign affairs are urgent and require immediate attention; they will not conveniently wait for the next generation to solve them. Finally, and most fundamentally, the next generation will be no better prepared than this one unless the mature citizens, who so greatly influence the curriculum of the schools and colleges, become convinced by their own experience that an understanding of foreign affairs is an essential element in the education of all young people."[2]

---

1. These were identified at its first meeting as: 1) International education at all levels, primary through adult, 2) Foreign languages at all levels, 3) Advanced training and research in language and area studies, 4) International exchanges of teachers and students, and 5) Business, trade, and financial interests in foreign languages and international studies.

2. Cyril O. Houle and Charles A. Nelson, The University, the Citizen, and World Affairs, p. 15. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1956.

All three of these arguments remain as valid today as they were over twenty years ago.

The President's Commission was aware of these considerations when in its initial statement of the five areas on which it will focus its work, it included international education and foreign languages "at all levels of education, primary through adult." Although this presents a task which is as complex as it is all-inclusive, it also opens the door to certain collaborative efforts among and between educational institutions and the communities they serve which might have been overlooked by a more narrowly-focused mandate. It is to these efforts at reaching this more broadly-defined clientele to which the rest of this paper will be devoted.

Among the institutions, organizations, and agencies already active in world affairs programming for adults may be included:

1- National and community-based voluntary associations--both those with a primary world affairs focus (like World Affairs Councils) and those with more generalized interests, but including world affairs (like the League of Women Voters); not to be overlooked are such cultural organizations as libraries, museums, art galleries, etc.

2- Colleges and universities (two-year, four-year, and graduate) with traditions of "extension" or "outreach" missions and with strong town-gown relationships (including both correspondence courses and face-to-face programs); more recently, the NDEA-financed Language and Area Centers have also become active in these outreach activities;

3- Media: if one distinguishes between "elite" and "mass" education in world affairs,[3] it may be that the media present the most effective potential approach to mass education about foreign policy issues and international affairs generally; included herein are newspapers, pamphlets, and books as well as radio, TV, and films, all of which could be far better utilized in the international education of both the adult citizenry and students at all levels.

World affairs programming by all three categories of institutions suffers from many of the same weaknesses: lack of continuity over time and non-uniformity in quality of eduation; failure to clearly identify audience targets and collaborate with other parallel interest groups; gaps in knowledge about suitable resources and various techniques of program delivery systems; weak organization and/or planning skills; and inadequate funding. Obviously, not all educational systems, voluntary

---

3. In his pithy booklet on Global Dimensions in U.S. Education: The Community, experienced world affairs educator William C. Rogers writes, "The field is torn by an ongoing debate between the proponents of elite and mass education, with the arguments resting in part on different concepts of democracy. Those who favor mass world affairs education point to the one man-one vote principle .... They prefer programs making heavy use of the mass media and hope for large audiences in public places. ...The elitists, on the other hand, point to the fact that the world affairs audience is really very small, and that very few people have any direct influence on either foreign policy opinion or decisions." William C. Rogers, Global Dimensions in U.S. Education: The Community, pp. 4-5. Center for War/Peace Studies, New York, 1972.

organizations involved in world affairs education, or media outlets can be painted with the same brush, for their programming expertise and educational impact vary considerably from one part of the country to another and even from one part of a state to another.

Recognizing this diversity in both the quantity and quality of the world affairs education which is available to citizens throughout the country, what might be some viable approaches toward increasing the level of both? Under the constraints of time and space, an outline paper of this brief length can do no more than suggest the kinds of strategies which might produce the widest and deepest impact on public interest, knowledge, and attitudes about international issues. I will therefore group them under A. resource/program collaboration, B. political/institutional initiatives, and C. financial implications, with two or three specific suggestions under each category simply as examples of the kinds of policies which might be included.

A. Resource/Program Collaboration: Greater cooperation and linkages should be encouraged and established between the resources of the colleges and universities, the international education needs of their communities, and the program delivery system of the media and the voluntary agencies involved in world affairs education. In addition, the current international programming of the media and adult education organizations aimed at citizen education in world affairs should also be focused in such a way as to meet the needs of primary and secondary school teachers; conversely, teacher education in world affairs (currently conducted by the state school systems themselves, by select World Affairs Councils, and by various Language and Area Centers) should be expanded in a systematic way and extended to aim at and reach wider adult audiences.

Examples: 1. Language and Area Centers could regularly seek to work with and through such community organizations as World Affairs Councils, Adult Education Associations, and others in their attempts to fulfill their "outreach" mandates. In such a partnership, the Centers would provide their expertise on the substance of international issues and developments while the community organizations would provide their expertise on audience identification and program delivery.

2. Media programs with international content should draw upon college and university resources to portray more fully and accurately the nature and problems of an interdependent world, particular states and areas, and U.S. interests and policies toward both. Increased communication between radio and television with both educational institutions and community volunteer organizations--perhaps through utilization of community advisory bodies--could help provide better linkages between the international educational needs of the community and media coverage. This has been done successfully in a number of communities, to the mutual benefit of both sectors.

3. Finally, the many and varied voluntary organizations and associations engaged in citizen education in world affairs (local and national, single issue and general) must develop an effective system of regularized collaboration. The diversity which characterizes world affairs councils around the country as well as

other voluntary organizations engaged in citizen education in world affairs is both their strength and their weakness. Their knowledge of and responsiveness to local needs provides them with a link to their communities which no national organization, no matter how sophisticated, can duplicate. Yet their relative isolation from one another and from the national centers of decision-making and international elan (i.e., Washington, New York, and, occasionally the West Coast) deprives them of the insights and contacts so necessary to their function as "opinion leaders" in their own communities. This situation necessitates a more effective and regularized communications network which could link community organizations with national organizations, professional associations, and government agencies[4] through a national "clearinghouse" of information, resources, and speakers. This could be supplemented by a national program of leadership training in the development of greater competencies in program planning and implementation.

B. Political/Institutional Initiatives: The public at large will not support international education activities and programs either for itself or for students at any level until it is convinced that the national interest of this country and the public's own enlightened self-interest are vitally dependent upon such education. Only then will resources be provided to fill the very serious information and knowledge gaps in the U.S. body politic. The evidence of the problem abounds, but it must be made comprehensible to the average citizen and its crucial nature made clear by the very highest levels of government.

Examples: 1. The President himself must make the "internationalization" of the American public a priority item of his administrative and legislative programs and strive to persuade the Congress of the very vital national interests to be served by a vigorous program of international education at all levels. As Robert Ward has so aptly pointed out in his CSIS monograph on National Needs for International Education,[5] the President will find natural allies in the Department of State,[6] U.S. Office of Education, National Endowment for the Humanities, National Science Foundation and, one might add, in the new International Communication Agency, in the Foreign Language Institute of the Department of Defense, and in the educational institutions of this country as well.

---

4. Such as the National Council of Community World Affairs Organizations and the Foreign Policy Association, the International Studies Association and the professional language and area studies associations, and the Department of State and the International Communication Agency as examples of each group.

5. Robert E. Ward, National Needs for International Education, pp. 15-16. Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., 1977.

6. Such mutually beneficial programs to both academia and government as the "Diplomat in Residence" and "Scholar in Residence" programs of the State Department could be expanded and perhaps supplemented by a "Citizen in Residence" program involving leaders of nongovernmental organizations.

2. U.S. educational institutions must organize and adapt themselves better to meet the international education needs of all of their constituencies: their own students at all levels; faculty, teachers, and administrators; and the public at large. Both the collaborative programs suggested in recommendation A and the creation of statewide organizations of representatives from primary, secondary, and higher education, from all sectors of media, and from the voluntary associations engaged in world affairs education to devise and implement state-wide plans and programs of international education are viable first steps in this ongoing process.

3. The International Communication Agency should be empowered to take the lead--in collaboration with the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research and Bureau of Public Affairs, National Public Broadcasting, and National Educational Television--to devise a nation-wide program of regularized and systematic dissemination of information on international affairs. A blue ribbon advisory committee or regulatory commission drawn from the private sector and representing business, labor, agriculture, academia, non-governmental associations, and other relevant groups could adequately ensure a balanced presentation and avoid the temptation to move from information to propaganda.

C. Financial Implications: Commission recommendations concerning federal funding must take into consideration not only the needs of citizen education in world affairs, but also all of the other international education needs identified by the Commission. At a minimum, however, I would ascribe to the recommendations set forth in Robert Ward's CSIS pamphlet on National Needs for International Education[7] that the authorization of NDEA Title VI be renewed at the existing level of $75 million. An intensive and imaginative campaign must also be undertaken to persuade the private sector (the corporate world as well as foundations) that federal funding, although essential, is not sufficient, and must be supplemented. A comprehensive and persuasive rationale for corporate and foundation support of international education which would include their own self-interest would be helpful in this regard. In addition, an educational effort must be designed to meet the needs of specific "sub-groups" from which funding is sought--e.g., business, labor, foundations, etc.

1. With regard to citizen education, the NDEA Title VI funding recommended above would 1) provide some $37.5 million for international education at the kindergarten through twelfth grade and at the adult education level (as provided in Section 603), and 2) provide for the continuation and support of the NDEA Language and Area Centers both for the development of training and research programs and as resources for outreach activities.

2. Funding (either public or private) should also be provided for the implementation of recommendations A-3 (private sources) and B-3 (public sources). Appropriate legislation to implement B-3 must also be introduced and carefully followed and monitored throughout the legislative process.

In conclusion, it should also be noted that the financial aspects of these recommendations, although essential to their success, are not onerous. Equally important, and perhaps even more crucial, is the political will which must be exerted by both the executive and legislative branches in order to persuade the public and the bureaucracy that the problem itself is serious enough to warrant their serious attention. That alone is half the battle.

---

7. Ward, National Needs for International Education, p. 16.

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS, FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES ANALYSIS OF RELATIONSHIPS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Samuel L. Hayden
Council of the Americas

and

Leslie W. Koepplin
Rutgers University[1]

I. Introduction

This study addresses only one of the concerns of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies--namely the relationship of international studies, foreign languages and international business. Previous investigations on this topic have been made by such organizations as the American Council on Education, the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, and the now defunct Education and World Affairs. These efforts proceeded from the assumption that there is a direct utility of language and area studies skills for corporations operating overseas, and that preparation of students in professional schools of business administration is incomplete without some form of internationalization. However, multinational corporations, while supporting these efforts in concept, have not appreciably tapped these university resources in practice. Addressing the several reasons why this match has not been more fully realized, it is the purpose of this study to analyze and make recommendations for enhancing these critical relationships.

The concerns of the Commission in this arena derive from a number of political and economic facts. Recent record trade deficits, the declining value of the dollar in international markets, inflation, reduced productivity and a suspected diminution of innovative capacity have all helped to create an environment in the United States favorable to a renewed focus on international business generally and on export promotion in particular. These economic facts place increased national expectations on business, while the U.S. government is presently in the midst of a number of policy considerations that might assist in easing international business operation. Through a more open trade atmosphere being proposed by the Multilateral Trade Negotiations of GATT, the Carter Administration and Congress are concentrating on reducing disincentives to trade, renewing and revising the Export Administration Act and taking measures to promote exports by small and medium sized firms. One thrust of this paper is that relevant university expertise should be factored into this effort.

Exhortations directed at U.S. firms to increase exports cannot easily be legislated. An inertia that keeps many U.S. firms rooted only in the domestic economy is a result, in part, of ethnocentric attitudes and, in part, of fragmented

---

1. The contents of this paper do not necessarily represent the views of the Council of the Americas or Rutgers University.

and often restrictive U.S. government policy. The challenge is to maintain economic leadership through the stimulation and harnessing of uptapped resources both in business and academe. A first critical need is to instill a national export consciousness to raise awareness of the benefits and necessity of exporting; a second is to find practical ways of making this happen. The working hypothesis of this study is that mutually beneficial ways and means can be devised to harness university and other resources and capabilities to U.S. business' manpower and information needs, and that this productive relationship can be catalyzed by the U.S. government through incentives and policy direction.

One of the classic problems in exploring this relationship of academe, business and government is that, except in the most ad hoc fashion, there are simply no established lines of communication among the three principals on this or any other specific issue. What we have done is to identify what it is that motivates each group to act in established ways, and to raise the possibility of new but related activities. Our findings on the utility of language and area studies in the hiring practices of U.S. international firms corroborate past studies; they are "pluses" but mostly secondary to functional business skills of accounting, marketing, finance, etc. Despite this fact, our conclusion is that other productive relationships could be explored and constructed in mutually beneficial ways by realistically exploiting the strengths and needs of each sector.

II. Business

Our methodology for analyzing the current and possible ways that corporations utilize university resources and expertise was to design a simple guide for personal and telephone interviews of a small, select group of corporations. The corporations include American International Group, American Medical International, Bank of America, Du Pont, Exxon, Ford, General Electric, GTE, Morrison-Knudsen, Parsons, Sears, Security Pacific National Bank, Westinghouse, and Whittaker. These interviews by no means represent a statistically valid sample of U.S. business. Our goal was to get a sense of what is being done in utilizing university resources and what might be possible, recognizing motivating factors of both business executives and academics. A sample of the interview guide is attached.

Our interviews led to a generalized profile of current collaboration between business and academe. NONE of the interviewed firms had ever hired a person at entry level specifically because of his or her foreign language or area studies background. Corporations usually worry about language and acculturation preparation of executives for overseas assignments only shortly before the actual physical move is to be made. The lead time varies according to the company and specific circumstances. Such preparation is contracted through specialized organizations like Berlitz, the Business Council for International Understanding, the Overseas Briefing Associates, and others. University language programs are not sought, much less used, because they are believed to be neither specialized nor flexible. Furthermore, U.S. international firms' operations reflect the belief that English is the language of international business. And while it is unanimously reported that fewer U.S. nationals are being sent abroad because of the incredible expense (often 2.5 times a U.S. salary), English is still seen as the dominant language.

U.S. firms, therefore, have a high interest in hiring foreign students studying in this country, and often track their academic careers in order to be able to make job offers directly to them. Although foreign language skills are not seen as unimportant (many business representatives are fluent in other languages), it would be difficult to measure the cost effectiveness of a firm's overseas business as a result of some hypothetical investment in language training.

The interviews also revealed little history of internships for students or faculty, and almost no reliance on faculty research that is factored into corporate information systems. Most large corporations generate their own research at the headquarters and in the field offices. Facets of corporate activity are studied as social, economic or political phenomena, but rarely is Ph. D.-level research fed into the corporate decision-making process. That is not the purpose of university research. Therefore, it is perhaps natural that there would be a poor fit between university research capacities and corporate needs for this kind of service.

The firms interviewed are mostly among the "Fortune 500" corporations. Although it is perhaps evident, it bears repeating that U.S. international corporations should not be viewed as monolithic or uniform in behavior. For example, some new-to-international-market financial institutions are forecasting tremendous growth overseas, while more experienced banks are seeing a leveling-off of growth; some firms are efficiency seeking through integrated operations worldwide, while others are resource seeking; some are predominantly exporters from the United States, while others manufacture in host country markets to service local consumption or for export to third countries; some are mainly exporters, while others are direct investors. Often individual firms incorporate many of these facets simultaneously. In addition, sectoral differences occur whereby engineering and construction firms have different concerns and behavior than do service, agribusiness or manufacturing firms. Approaches for linking university or other resources to international business should, therefore, recognize these essential differences.

At the headquarters level, international divisions of corporations are generally organized on a regional basis, as are many international studies units on campuses. As in universities, some regions are more important than others for corporations. U.S. foreign direct investment, according to the Department of Commerce, is roughly $150 billion. Approximately 80 percent of that total has been directed to Canada, Japan, Western Europe and other industralized countries. Of the remaining 20 percent, that in developing countries, roughly four-fifths is in Latin America. Even here, the concentration is in a few countries such as Mexico and Brazil. As an indication of concentration, the Commerce Department has projected that $3.7 billion of new plant and equipment will be placed in Latin America by U.S. firms in 1979, $1.7 billion of which will be in Brazil alone. These numbers reflect the relative unimportance of Africa, as compared with Latin America, when it comes to U.S. business activity.

Nonetheless, there is an increasingly stronger relationship between developing countries and the United States in total trade. In 1977 developing countries bought more than a third of all our exports. During the 1970's U.S. sales to developing countries grew 22 percent annually compared with 15 percent to industralized countries. The potential for trade with communist countries, with perhaps the exception of the People's Republic of China, will probably continue to be limited.

Again, while these figures can be refined, they do suggest that differentiation is important, that African studies programs, as one example, are relatively less attractive to business than are Latin American studies, which focus on a more financially compelling world area.

Firms looking for overseas opportunities generally export products before they invest abroad. A profile of U.S. exporting firms is revealing: Except for a core of large, high-powered corporations, U.S. firms are generally tied to a domestic orientation. The size, stability and wealth of the U.S. market have not necessitated an international push. According to the Department of Commerce and as reported in the New York Times, 100 firms account for 50 percent of U.S. exports, 250 firms generate 80 percent of U.S. exports. In its effort to increase small and medium sized firm investment abroad, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation has determined that 8,000 firms with net sales less than $100 million (i.e., not in the "Fortune 1000" list) engage in exporting. In all, these firms probably account for the remaining 20 percent of U.S. export sales. Another way of putting into perspective the highly concentrated structure of U.S. international business is to recognize that a recently proposed, but rejected, merger of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the National Association of Manufacturers would have resulted in an association of more than 50,000 members. The firms that we interviewed are part of this structure that aggressively does look to overseas markets.

This kind of structure suggests two separate, but not necessarily mutually exclusive, approaches for linking university resources and programs to international business. One is geared to the large firms whose expertise and involvement in international matters are great. Another attempt to service small and medium sized firms in need of technical assistance and specific studies to become internationally directed. It is clear that the market concept needs to be applied to the university-business relationship because the diversity within business is certainly as great or greater than the diversity in the universities. For example, an "export awareness" education program could effectively utilize universities, but need not be so directed to the 250 highly motivated export firms. Rather it would be geared to the large number of small and medium sized firms and to the public generally. If this analysis is correct, then it is perhaps also time that national, centralized solutions promoted by government programs and incentives must account for these differences in a way that induces localized or regional initiatives.

Another set of factors is also important and potentially beneficial in linking persons within business to the universities. Corporations often link themselves on a regional, state or city basis to various associations. World trade clubs, foreign trade associations, councils on foreign relations, chambers of commerce, state departments of commerce, and specific international regional groupings often serve as surrogates and forums for certain kinds of activities. These groupings have not been adequately utilized by universities as means of initiating contact with corporations or of exploring possible joint program development. They represent an important resource for universities, as well as for individual firms.

Most corporations understand the need for international awareness among their employees. The difficulty is to find the time and the incentive mechanisms to make such awareness a reality. In a sense, large firms need much less attention, however, than do the multitude of small firms that have little international awareness and literally no export experience. Both tracks of business can be linked in various ways to university resources. The recommendations that follow in Section V outline several specific possibilities.

III. International Studies

Our survey of international business has found very little corporate use of international academic resources at American universities. We believe that there are six major internal university reasons for this lack of relationships between international studies and international business: 1) America's international studies capacities are relatively new--most date only from the early 1960's; 2) there is a lack of funds for curriculum innovation involving foreign language and area studies, international business studies and international business; 3) the internal campus reward system does not facilitate communication among foreign language and area studies, the schools of business and international business; 4) there are problems within the schools of business regarding international business education; 5) there is no forum for systematic, sustained communication between practitioners of international studies and international business; and 6) there is no real delivery capacity in U.S. business schools functionally geared to emerging business needs.

Much of America's international studies capacities, particularly in non-Western areas of Africa, Latin America and the Near East, are less than 30 years old. This capacity was created in the early 1960's through internal campus resources, including tuition, endowment funds and state appropriations for the public universities, augmented by external sources which included foundations and the federal government. The Ford Foundation contributed approximately $300 million to this effort and the federal government, through NDEA Title VI legislation, has provided a level close to $250 million of funding since 1958. The Ford Foundation terminated its funding in 1968 at a time when the international resources had finally been solidified in campus budgets, but when there was no clear sense of how these new resources could be related to international business. This period also marked the start of general university budget constraints from state and federal sources. Funding under NDEA Title VI has not filled that void. In terms of 1958 dollars, inflation has taken a heavy toll on federal funding of academic institutions. There has simply been no new funding available for experimentation in curriculum design and innovation between international studies and international business. It is important to note that even in the heyday of foundation and federal funding, political and academic, not economic, need triggered support.

The Office of Education's funding of foreign language and area studies under NDEA Title VI legislation provides an excellent picture of which universities have substantial international studies capacities. In order to qualify for federal funding, which is awarded on a nationally competitive basis, a university must have an internally funded base of faculty appointments in a variety of departments, supplemented by staff and library resources in the various geographical areas which the Office of Education defines: Africa, the Near East, East Asia, South and Southeast Asia, the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and Latin America. Some 60 percent of these funds are awarded to 12 universities: U.C. Berkeley, UCLA, Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Stanford, Washington, Wisconsin, and Yale. Furthermore, within these dozen universities, the overwhelming majority of international studies resources is concentrated in the humanities and the social sciences. Professor Richard Lambert in his well known survey of 1970 noted the disparity in numbers between the language instructors, historians and political scientists on one hand and the economists on the other. We have detected no measurable shifts since then. We think it fair to say that

what this collection of 12 large prestigious universities does best, particularly in the humanities and social sciences, is research oriented to graduate training, particularly at the Ph.D. level. In addition, the faculties of these universities have a reward system firmly based in the disciplines. It is here that professional stature, tenure and promotion are earned. These interrelated factors--the mission of the Ph.D. granting institutions in the humanities and social sciences, and the faculty reward system--provide very little impetus to establish and maintain contact with either the schools of business or the international business community.

The international dimension of the schools of business has been the subject of a recent excellent survey by Professor Lee Nehrt under the auspices of the American Council on Education. The survey found a lack of attention to the international area in the entire business curriculum. Some 75 percent of the recently graduated Ph.D.'s and DBA's, who represent the business faculty of the future, had no international course work at all; an additional 10 percent had only one course. In addition, the Nehrt survey found a need to review the undergraduate business curriculum and the need to design innovative international programs directed toward the non-traditional mid-career student. The survey's prime recommendation was for the creation of a series of faculty seminars directed toward establishing an international component in each of the traditional functional areas of business education such as accounting, finance, marketing and business policy. The first of these seminars, funded by General Electric, was held in 1978; two more are planned. In addition, the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business has recently mandated that any school of business that wishes to receive or maintain accreditation status must carry an international component in its curriculum.

The important point to emphasize here is the newness of these developments; the Nehrt report only appeared in 1977. In very simple language, one might find the following scenario: a faculty member from a foreign language department, concerned about dropping enrollments, walks across campus to the School of Business and finds neither international ability nor interest.

The last point is that there is a lack of a mechanism for sustained, systematic communication between the interested parties. Academics, particularly in the humanities and social sciences, very often do not have good contacts in the business community. They do not know which firms might have personnel requirements which could draw on their students; likewise business has no central point of reference to survey the academic community for some indication of mutual gain. There is simply no one place where America's international studies and America's international business interests come together in a long-term, systematic way. In some instances, there is more than a lack of communication channels--there is what amounts to mutual mistrust.

IV. Government

The U.S. government operates in many ways to affect both business and academe. For better or worse, the government is in fact an intimate partner of both. New policy directions through incentives and disincentives are formulated on a continuing basis to control and re-direct many activities.

Literally every business executive, when given the opportunity, as in our interviews, decries the seemingly increased intervention of government in the daily international operations of private enterprise. Many executives feel that any positive business development initiatives of the government are more than offset by disincentives or policies that hamstring business. Despite their original good intentions, regulatory practices have had a detrimental effect on corporate competitiveness internationally. Without belaboring this point, the following is an exemplary list of such practices and policies: increased personal tax liability on U.S. citizens working abroad, inadequate and untimely export licensing procedures, inadequate export financing, boycott legislation, human rights legislation, inadequate embassy support services, increased paperwork and reporting requirements, and others. Most corporations feel that their competitiveness is reduced because of these "restrictive" policies. They also feel that foreign firms have a distinct advantage given the positive incentives they receive from their own governments.

Although the government, particularly the Department of Commerce, has appointed several task forces to study the loose system of disincentives as well as new ways to promote exports, it is not clear how new initiatives would be constructed or coordinated. One concern is that if U.S. economic and business presence is reduced abroad, corporations will not be a source of growth for area studies and language programs in universities. On the other hand, without forging links between university resources and corporations, we will never know the measurable productive relationship between the two.

The personal tax liability of U.S. corporate personnel abroad is particularly troublesome. Unofficial estimates of the number of Americans abroad in corporate activity are revealing. Sears International has roughly 24,000 employees abroad of whom only about 60 are Americans; in General Electric 500 of 110,000 abroad are Americans. These two examples are indicative of the enormous expense that must be incurred to station Americans abroad. They also tell why foreign students in the United States are so attractive to corporations; these students are as well educated as Americans and do not require foreign language and host country acculturation training; they are also much less expensive given the U.S. tax consideration. The long-range effect of this kind of tendency needs to be assessed, but it is perhaps not premature to conclude that for such firms the foreign student is simply much more valuable than the American student for international operations and that international studies are not as important as they could be. In some nations, it is also politically wiser to do this given national sensitivities and restrictions in obtaining work visas.

It is not our purpose here to argue for deregulation. We seek to lay out the possible connection, albeit indirect, between government policies on international business and the long-term health, growth and value of language and area studies at the university.

The federal government has provided many to assist in the internationalization of universities, as have several corporations. It is now considering ways to increase U.S. exports. In both cases, incentives have been the key to prompting action. These incentives usually are seen as investments in future actions and performance. New government policies and support can help to create new relationships between university and corporate resources, thereby leading to the attainment

of broader national objectives. These objectives are qualitative as well as quantitative. For example, for FY 1980 and 1981, U.S. foreign assistance will total less than $9 billion annually while U.S. foreign direct investment will probably exceed $170 billion. Business diplomacy is perhaps as important as state diplomacy, and this fact needs to be recognized by U.S. government, U.S. academic institutions, and U.S. business itself.

Our recommendations follow the two tracks outlined in the introduction above. Large, experienced international firms will increase their effectiveness overseas more through reduced government regulation than by any kind of immediate ties to universities. However, the cultural, political and economic expertise available in universities has the potential for assisting long-range and strategic planning for the large firms. Organization and effective delivery mechanisms for such expertise need to be explored. Small, inexperienced domestic firms need both financial and technical assistance from the government and other sources to induce them to enter international markets. Smaller firms also have compounded problems because they are subject to the same regulation as large firms. In each case, however, universities could play specific but different roles. Export promotion by small inexperienced internationally aspiring firms will not come about by Small Business Administration loans or by government pleas. These, coupled with other factors including university resources, will be needed for such an effect to be accomplished.

V. Recommendations

The recommendations that follow recognize three primary actors: academe, business and government. At various times, all three have addressed the question of the role of international studies in international business. The reality is that there is precious little precedent of international business use of international studies' information and personnel. Despite this lack of precedent, colleges and universities have argued that international studies are in the national interest and deserve national support. If the argument continues to be used, there must be recognition that international business is a significant part of the national interest. The recognition has perhaps always been made at least tacitly, but now it is more important because of international economic problems and the necessity of greater business performance both here and abroad. The following emanates from our working hypothesis that an unrealized potential exists between business and academe and that the government can provide the incentives and funds to explore these new relationships.

Our recommendations are the following:

1. That the U.S. Office of Education funding for the traditional foreign language and area studies centers be increased by at least 25 percent and that these funds be earmarked for international business and economic studies. We also suggest that USOE policy require, whenever possible, the involvement of international business subject matters in these centers--both in the guidelines for center competition and the subsequent programs. Each recipient of funds should be required to appoint an Academic/Business Advisory Council.

At the current level of NDEA funding for these centers, a 25 percent increase would allow each center between $10,000 and $50,000 to improve their ability to deal with the business community in specific ways, such as the development of specialized short courses on languages and cultures, translation services, and environmental analyses of individual countries. Furthermore, by making the center competition dependent on some greater involvement with business, there is an internal incentive to improve relationships with the international business community.

2. That the U.S. Office of Education fund at least four innovative undergraduate and four graduate programs in international business studies each year for the next five years at a minimal level of $100,000 each. The focus of the undergraduate programs should be either in developing international components for the undergraduate core business curriculum in accounting, finance, marketing and business policy or in augmenting traditional undergraduate curriculum preparation for the international MBA student. The focus of the innovative graduate programs would be in the development of new international programs for the non-traditional mid-career or part-time student.

3. That the government support the creation of a system of internships for students directed towards an international business career. These could be funded in either of two ways: the use of federally supported fellowships to work in this area or the creation of a simple system of tax incentives for participating firms based on new expenditures for international business personnel.

   One of the most encouraging parts of our interviews with business involved their interest in the use of student interns with foreign language and area expertise. The firms endorsed this concept, and we recommend that the Presidential Commission, in its final deliberations, pay particular attention to the establishment of such a program. Whatever mechanism is created must take into account the extraordinary costs to business in the use of temporary personnel. Reduction or elimination of these costs would enhance the possibility of internship programs, as would prompt and minimal paperwork requirements.

4. That the U.S. Office of Education and the Department of Commerce fund at least five major centers of international business studies and research in America's major metropolitan areas that have heavy involvement in international studies and international business. These five centers, perhaps located in World Trade Centers, the Conference Board or similar organizations, would be funded on an experimental basis for at least three years at a level of $300,000 each. Their mission would be threefold: 1) they would serve as a clearinghouse for international studies-international business exchange; 2) they would disseminate information on international business potential and on successful joint programs between business and academe; and 3) they would serve as a forum for the discussion and development of government policy on international business and international studies.

This recommendation is designed to cover a multitude of needs expressed by business executives and academicians in our discussions with them. In the first instance, many of the business people we talked with were surprised to learn that American universities have extensive resources in international studies; most did not know what foreign languages and area studies centers are. A clearinghouse of information available on international studies resources could be a first step in an attempt to alert potential users of this resource.

Most importantly, a clearinghouse could provide a systematic forum for continuing business-academic-government discussions on needs and policies. International business is by nature flexible and changing; its information and operating needs also change; its personnel needs, therefore, also change. A clearinghouse could do much to establish a base for the kind of communication among the three groups that we see as crucial to a future increased U.S. role in the international economy.

5. That the Small Business Administration and the Department of Commerce fund a network of Small Business Development Centers throughout the country. The SBDCs could be modeled after the Land Grant system for agriculture development and extension in each state. The purpose of each center would be to bring together as many useful resources as are possible to help develop and revitalize small and medium sized firms. Export assistance and export education, along with domestic concerns, would be functions of these centers. The resources at the centers could include university faculty and students, state departments of commerce, experts from exporting firms, retired executives from the International Executive Service Corps, and others. Activities, in addition to direct technical assistance to participating firms, could include studies in government policy on small and medium sized business, market opportunity surveys, university curriculum design, enterpreneurship studies, and others. Methods of operation to carry out these activities and functions could include team studies and technical assistance done by students under the direction of faculty and business participants.

The Small Business Development Center exists in a few locations. This concept needs to be extended nationally because of the wide dispersion of small business. It is probably true that small firms need to be vital domestically before management time can be devoted to exporting. The effectiveness of the SBDC will be more likely if it is run and directed locally rather than centralized in one or a few locations. The SBDC concept was introduced in Congress, passed, but eventually vetoed as inflationary. It should be reexamined in light of national productivity and export needs, as well as a way to induce universities to pay increased attention to private sector entrepreneurial needs.

We have no specific recommendations for corporations and universities as we do for government. However, if there is one thing that each can do it is to try to have an openmindedness to experimentation. Universities need to encourage much greater contact among relevant departments. If there is a lack of interest in or an aversion to program development between area studies centers and the business school, then government funding may not be as effective as it should be. In the same vein, corporate executives almost always support the need for the internationalization of the education of students and the training of employees. Somehow the support does not measurably translate from rhetoric into practice or program. Greater coordination between the public affairs function dealing with universities or government and actual corporate programs that can utilize faculty or students internally needs to be strengthened. Experimentation with international executive development seminars or short-term internships for faculty and students would not be that costly to corporations.

What is lacking in this broad arena of language, area studies and international business is a proven track record of success. Belief is that foreigners in general are better with languages and in other cultures than are Americans. This is cited as one reason why foreign competition is tougher for American firms. The question that needs to be answered is how much better can American business do abroad if language and area skills are married to U.S. technology and management expertise? It is not an easy question to answer, but worth an attempt. It will take cooperation within and among the three principals, and each will have to invest some risk capital.

Finally, it is our very strong sense that the future economic welfare of the United States will depend substantially on an increase of international awareness in the business community. There is a weakness structurally in a base of some 100 firms accounting for 50 percent of our exports. One way to begin to augment this base is to ensure that <u>every</u> college student has some international awareness. An internationalization of the undergraduate curriculum might well be the strongest possible contribution to the long-range economic strength and stability of the United States. Therefore, while the above five recommendations are immediate first steps, of continuing importance for the long-term is the internationalization of the undergraduate curriculum.

APPENDIX

Interview Guide

1. Has the international segment of your business increased or decreased in the last five years?

   If it has increased, where by country or area?

   Has it increased by Export?

   Investment?

   Other?

2. Where do you recruit international personnel?

   Entry level? (If college, by background and level)

   If mid career, do you do internal training?

   If so, what does it look like?

   If not, what do you rely on?

   If you use nationals, do you give any training?

   Has the number of U.S. citizens abroad employed by you increased or decreased over the last five years?

3. How do you deal with language differences?

   In foreign country?

   In home or U.S branch office?

4. Are you satisfied with your sources of information about foreign countries?

   Do any of your relations with universities incorporate use of foreign language and area expertise or international business expertise?

5. How are your relationships with the U.S. government in international business matters?

Note: Ask about competition in all five areas and if there is substantial difference, press the point.

MESSAGE TO THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Cyrus Vance

My colleagues at the Department of State and I were greatly encouraged by the President's decision to appoint a Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. We welcome you, Chairman Perkins, and the other distinguished members as you continue your important deliberations in the Department June 7 and 8. We're glad you picked State as the locus for this particular meeting because we interpret it to mean that you share our view that so many of our country's fundamental interests are affected directly by the way our fellow citizens respond to change in today's and tomorrow's world.

Our citizens are unlikely to support for long courses of action which seem remote or unrelated to their fundamental interests. Without the window of understanding of foreign peoples and nations which language and international studies help provide, they cannot be expected to sustain the efforts needed to cope with change or back leaders trying to utilize the dynamics of American society to achieve the goals we work for.

In addition to this broad conceptual framework for your efforts, I am deeply interested in the Commission's work to sustain and enlarge the pools of talent in the educational-research-training sectors of our society from which the Department draws much valuable talent, advice, and constructive criticism for its activities. We hope you will make recommendations to improve the systems we have so we in the government and the private sector and academia can fill our functions better. You have already heard some of our views on these matters. I have asked some of my colleagues to share with you today additional thoughts in response to your question.

In particular we will welcome the Commission's view on how to forge more lasting organic links between the concerned elements in and out of the government. I see that linkage as a prime requirement at a time of heavy pressure on American ability to meet increasingly complex demands. We simply must use our intellectual resources better.

In this regard, I want to assure you that the Department will work actively with other elements of the Government to develop organizational approaches to provide increased coordination and better management of Government's role. This would help us work more closely with the private sector, foundations, and academia to meet our joint and several priority needs. At a time of resource stringency, we have additional incentives to use the means we have more effectively based on our best collective judgement. I also see such coordinated efforts as the way to sustain the participants' interests in the longer term by providing the indispensable underpinnings for additional efforts.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of State will do whatever it can to encourage and to help the Commission as you reach the last phase of your work and prepare your report. You can be sure we will give the report careful and prompt attention when it reaches us because you are charged with finding ways to assure greater American competence in areas that are at the heart of our business.

June 7, 1979

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1979—O-311-222 (2044)